

The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER 1907

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

LATIN COMPOSITION.

IN the August number of this *Review* Mr. Rouse asks the questions 'What good purpose can be served by an exercise which is half wrong?' and 'How can any real literary feeling be present in one who knows no more of accident and idiom than to produce such a thing?' Then follows a sketch of the oral method applied to Latin teaching with a view to raising the present low standard of composition.

Now I wish to point out that in the questions above quoted and in the method proposed, there lurks a dubious assumption: dubious, first, because it is not clear; but secondly, because even if it were clear it is probably inadequate. If we judge what the assumption is by the method proposed, it would be that the object of teaching Latin is to give boys a power of using the language. If we judge from the questions asked, or rather from the second of them, there seems to be a different object assumed, viz. to cultivate a 'real literary feeling.' This is not at all the same thing as giving power to use the language, and it seems to me axiomatic that till we are clear about the object in view we shall never agree upon the methods to be adopted. Moreover, even if both these objects are allowed to be legitimate, there is another, very commonly spoken of, quite

different from either; and Mr. Rouse has not shown us if he is considering it at all: I mean the theory that Latin is taught because it is invaluable as an instrument to stimulate clearness of thought: in short as a 'gymnastic.'

In the well-known *Essays on a Liberal Education*, one of the writers plaintively, but truly, remarked that we have not yet made up our minds whether we read Latin authors for the sake of learning the language or learn the language in order to read the authors. To these two theories the 'Gymnastic' has recently been added. But what has escaped notice is that as long as Latin teachers do not make clear to themselves and to each other what they are aiming at, so long they are certain to produce feeble results because they will be more or less spoiling each other's work.

This can be illustrated by the fate of the proposal for oral Latin teaching in our secondary schools. Such teaching is I believe very rare, partly no doubt because it demands a considerable fluency on the part of the master, partly because many masters are aiming at something else than giving command of the language, viz. either at cultivating a literary taste, or at training to think. It is possible that a teacher who is aiming at the literary sense may hail the oral method

as a useful means to his end. He may say to himself 'these boys will never appreciate Virgil till they can read him easily; and to give the power of easy reading the oral method is excellent.' But suppose he is aiming at the gymnastic training of the mind, will his attitude be anything like so favourable? I doubt it. For the question now resolves itself into this:—Granted that clearness of thought, logical training in short, is the chief object of Latin teaching, do you give it as well by oral teaching as by the traditional method of exercises and construing? Many masters instinctively feel, I should say, that you do not. And if they feel that, they will not be eager about the oral method. And as the believers in the gymnastic theory are very numerous the oral method fares badly, and will fare badly *unless it can be shown to assist the gymnastic training.*

Now this is just where the difficulty lies. Some wise man, I forget who it was, remarked that the most superficial thinkers of his acquaintance were diplomats, who had been trained to acquire languages by the ear. And I think we should agree that if the oral method were perfectly applied, the result, if successful, would be a deceptive command of the language: deceptive, I mean, because it would represent very much less 'sweat of the brain' than a similar command given by the other method. A boy who can turn an English conditional sentence into Latin by ear has gained something no doubt in the process of learning how to do so; but it is something very different from, and I should say inferior to, that gained by the patient learner who has analysed the sentence, and wrestled with the ambiguities of *should, would, might*, etc., etc., in which our language abounds.

To this criticism there are two possible answers: (1) that the number of 'gymnasticists' is small: (2) that for purposes of logical training the oral method supplies material on which the mind can work; and this is where the traditional method fails. Many boys never reach the stage of logical thinking because they are never able to use their material, and sort it, and compare it. A certain command is necessary, and this command the old method fails to give.

(1) It cannot seriously be maintained that the number of 'gymnasticists' is small. I mean those who defend the teaching of Latin mainly on the ground of the logical training it gives. It is no doubt amazing how strong is the tendency among educated men to go on working without asking themselves what it is all about. But it is impossible to listen to any discussion or follow any controversy in the public press without inferring that every educational subject, Latin among the rest, is chiefly defended on the score of its 'training' power; and training means training to think.

(2) I think there is some force in this contention. It would follow from it that the oral method is chiefly needed for the less gifted boys, and of course it should not be the only one employed. We are in sore need of some psychology of the 'dunce' as we call him. What has his mind been doing before it produces a hopeless piece of composition? Speaking cautiously on a difficult question I would say that the failure is not due to the subject, but to the simple fact that at school 'dunces' are hurried along too fast. They are never allowed to see that their own work is an exemplification of law successfully applied to various phenomena, and long before they can do simple things well, they are turned on to more complex problems, and flounder along never really perceiving when they are out of their depth or not. This tragedy is partly due to large classes, partly to examinations; and if Mr. Rouse's method is applied to boys on the brink of the vast quagmire, I think it may be useful. To mediocre boys it might give an appearance of progress, but it would not *necessarily* mean progress in thought so much as in fluency.

There is more that might be said which I must suppress; but Mr. Rouse's question 'What good purpose can be served by an exercise which is half wrong?' demands a last word. It is very often forgotten that in the case of quite $\frac{99}{100}$ ths of our pupils such an exercise as Latin prose is only defensible on the ground that it trains the thinking powers, not at all because the boys are going some day to write prose like Cicero. But if we use Latin composition as a 'gymnastic' for a mediocre or dull boy with no sense

of idiom, obviously the performance may and will be very poor as to its results, but yet the gymnastic may be quite as successful as the state of the case permits. Why should we confuse the 'gymnastic' with the 'literary' aim? I cannot see that for many English

boys Latin composition has much to do with their literary sense. If they have any such sense, of which there is often no evidence, it should be trained by English teaching and learning good poetry.

E. LYTTELTON.

THE TRUE SCENE OF THE SECOND ACT OF THE *EUMENIDES* OF AESCHYLUS.

IN this paper I propose to inquire whether the scene of the Second Act of the *Eumenides* is rightly laid on the Acropolis and at the Erechtheum, as has been universally held, and as it was recently represented in the splendid performance of the play at Cambridge, or whether we must look for some other site which is more in keeping with the conditions of the trial of Orestes. It will at once be said, What objections are there to the traditional view—that the Acropolis is the true scene of the trial? That was the most famous spot in Athens, and on it stood the oldest temple of Athena, already known in Homeric days. Yet the difficulties of this view will be obvious as soon as they are stated. In the first place, though there were in Athens four localities all intimately associated with trials of persons charged with homicide, not one of these was situated on the Acropolis, though it is true weapons and other inanimate objects which had shed the blood of men or of oxen were tried in the Prytaneum, the ancient residence of the Archon Eponymus on the north slope of the Acropolis. Secondly, though in the play Orestes is represented as taking sanctuary at a shrine of Pallas, and as taking in his arms her ancient *βρέτας*, there is not the slightest evidence that any image of the goddess Athena on the Acropolis, whether ancient or recent, offered an asylum to those who fled before the avenger of blood. Thirdly, in the play the goddess is always termed Pallas by the Pythian Priestess, by Apollo, and by the Furies in dialogue, though on two occasions Orestes does certainly address her as Athena, and she is so termed by the Furies twice in choral parts. Yet we know for certain, both by literary tradition

and from inscriptions, that the goddess who dwelt in 'the strong house of Erechtheus' on the Acropolis was never called *Pallas*, but was invariably known either as *the Polias*, or as Athena (or Athenaia) Polias.¹

On the other hand I propose to show that (1) there was a very ancient tribunal (if not the most ancient at Athens) for cases of homicide, more especially for that class of homicide to which Orestes pleaded guilty, situated outside the city wall to the south-east of the Acropolis; (2) that there was here a most ancient wooden image (*ξύανον*) to which those whose hands were reddened with the blood of their fellow men might fly to avoid the instant vengeance of the pursuer; and (3) that this image was never known by the name of Athena or Athenaia, but always by that of Pallas or Palladion.

Now as there were five different localities in or near Athens closely connected from old with trials for bloodshed, it is most unlikely that Aeschylus would in this play lay the scene of the trial at any spot other than one of those associated in the popular mind from time immemorial with the trial of homicide. This is all the more unlikely since he represents the first tribunal for the trial of that crime as instituted for the trial of Orestes, whilst he also refers to the establishment on the Hill of Ares of a great council (*βουλευτήριον*) which was not only to try cases of deliberate murder, but also to keep ward and control over the public morals.²

¹ Cf. Frazer's note on Paus. i. 26. 5.

² *Eum.* 684 sqq.

κλύοιτ' ἂν ἤδη θεσμὸν, Ἀττικὸς λεῶς,
πρώτας δίκας κρίνοντες αἵματος χυτοῦ.
ἔσται δὲ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν Αἰγέως στρατῷ
ἀεὶ δικαστῶν τοῦτο βουλευτήριον.

Down to the time of Pausanias¹ (A.D. 180) there still survived at Athens five tribunals for cases of bloodshed. (1) There was the Areopagus, which sat on the famous hill that rises on the west over against the Acropolis. Here were tried cases of deliberate murder, wounding with malice, arson, and poisoning. (2) To the south-east of the Acropolis, outside the wall, lay an ancient shrine called the Palladion, so named from a very ancient image of Pallas, which tradition variously declared to have been brought from Ilium, or to have fallen from heaven, or else to have been set up by Athena in her repentance for having killed her playmate Pallas. Here sat the court known as the *τὸ ἐπὶ Παλλαδίου*, where were tried those who had committed involuntary homicide (*τοῖς ἀποκτείνανσιν ἀκουσίως*). 'Nobody denies that Demophon was the first person tried here,' but there is a difference of opinion as to the crime for which he was tried, *i.e.* whether it was for accidentally killing Argives by mistake, or for accidentally trampling an Athenian under his horse's feet in the dark. (3) There was the court known as the Delphinion, also situated on the east side of the Acropolis and outside the city wall. It was a shrine of Apollo of Delphi, and in it were tried cases of justifiable homicide, *e.g.* those who had slain an adulterer taken in the act. 'On such a plea Theseus was acquitted when he had slain the rebel Pallas and his sons. But the custom was in former days, before the acquittal of Theseus, that every manslayer either fled the country, or, if he stayed, was slain even as he slew.' Yet it will soon be seen that the court probably owed its name to an older legend. (4) At Phreattys, on a tongue of land projecting into the sea at Zea, was held a court to try any manslayer who, during his period of exile, might have committed another crime of the same character. The judges sat on the shore, whilst the accused was literally docked in a boat moored off the beach, that he might not pollute with the miasma of his guilt the land of Attica. (5) In the Prytaneum, as already stated, weapons, especially the axe with which was slain the ox at the Buphonia, were tried.

¹ i. 28, 8-12.

If it be said that Pausanias does not refer to the trial of Orestes as having taken place at the Palladion, and consequently that this shrine cannot be the true scene of the act, I may at once point out that there is the same objection to the Areopagus, for Pausanias² says that that court was first established to try Ares for the murder of Halirrhothius, and makes no mention of the trial of Orestes at all.

Aeschylus gives us a totally different account of the establishment of the first tribunal for manslaughter, but as he wrote some six centuries and a half before Pausanias, we are justified in assuming that his statement represents a far older legend than those of Pausanias, and accordingly we may leave on one side the latter's account of the first cases supposed to have been tried at the Palladion, the Delphinion, and the Areopagus. Originally the judges in all these five courts for bloodshed were the ancient body called the Ephetae. The King archon presided and probably with the fifty Ephetae made up the Fifty and One, a term by which the body was likewise known. According to Pollux³ the Ephetae were constituted by Draco. Up to that time the Basileus had investigated and tried all cases of bloodshed, but Draco referred such to the Fifty and One, and from this reference of such cases Pollux ascribes the origin of their name Ephetae. But like so many other provisions in Draco's enactments the body had only been reconstituted, having really existed from time immemorial. The fact that they were selected on the ground of high birth (*ἀριστιγέννητον αἰρεθέντας*) of itself indicates that they were a survival from oligarchic and monarchical times. It is highly probable that in the Ephetae presided over by the Archon Basileus (himself the shadow of the ancient king) we have the survival of the ancient Gerusia or Boule. This view will be found to be quite in accord with certain statements of Aeschylus.

By Solon's reforms the Ephetae were replaced on the Areopagus by a body consisting of ex-archons, though jurisdiction in the

² i. 28, 5.

³ viii. 120: for an excellent summary of the evidence relating to the Ephetae see Dr. Sandys' note on Aris. *Ath. Pol.* c. 57.

minor courts was still left to them. Aristotle¹ speaks as if they still continued to sit in these down to his day, but there is evidence that by the end of the fifth century B.C. ordinary dicasts sat in the Delphinion and Palladion, for we hear of seven hundred dicasts, a number inconsistent with the Fifty and One. Pollux² tells us that gradually the tribunal of the Ephetae was laughed to death.

It is clear that with the courts of Phreatys and of the Prytaneum we have nothing to do in our present inquiry. The Areopagus, the Palladion, and the Delphinion therefore remain as the three possible scenes for the asylum and trial of Orestes, unless we make the wild assumption that the dramatist laid the scene of the trial at some spot never associated either in fact or tradition with trials for homicide. It is useless to urge that the dramatists are not at all particular as to the spot in which a scene is laid. For though this may be so when an Attic dramatist is composing a play the scene of which is laid at Troy, at Argos, or at Thebes, he certainly would not expose himself to ridicule and criticism from his Attic audience when dramatising a legend which was indissolubly bound up with one of the courts established for homicide, the very origin of which was ascribed to the trial of Orestes.

Let us consider what are the conditions required for the spot where Orestes was tried. First of all there must be a most ancient image of the goddess. Secondly, it must be an image to which manslayers actually fled as suppliants when they could plead that the act was involuntary, as urged by Orestes in his own defence, or that it was justifiable, as was pleaded on his behalf by Apollo. Thirdly, this image ought to bear the name of Pallas and not that of Athena, for Apollo at Delphi orders Orestes to 'go to the city of Pallas and take your suppliant seat there embracing in your arms her ancient image. And there having judges to decide on these matters, and arguments in palliation of your crime, we will find means to relieve you from your troubles, for it was even in obedience to me that you slew that body which gave you birth.' Then

Apollo tells the Eumenides that Pallas will see justice done at the trial of Orestes. Fourthly, on that spot ought to sit the most ancient tribunal for trying homicide that was known at Athens, for Athena declares that the case of Orestes is too serious for one to decide, and therefore she will institute a *thesmos* to deal with such cases, who are to be the noblest of her citizens.³ These last words seem especially to apply to the Ephetae, who, as we have just seen, were chosen *ἀριστίδην*. Moreover, when Athena says that the case of Orestes is too great for one to decide, we seem to have a direct allusion to the tradition preserved in Pollux that 'in old days the king heard cases of bloodshed, but that Draco established the court of Ephetae.' Furthermore, this oldest court for homicide cannot be one for deliberate murder, but only for the trials of those who could plead extenuating circumstances.

Let us examine the respective claims of all the three competitors beginning with the Delphinion. As this was the shrine of the Apollo of Delphi, it is inconceivable that there would be in it a most ancient image of Pallas, such as that at which Orestes took sanctuary and which he clasped in his arms. For assuredly the object of adoration in the Delphinion would have been a statue of Apollo and not that of the goddess. Moreover, this shrine of Apollo was not an immemorial place of veneration, as is fully shown by its name, for it represents that particular form of cult connected with Apollo at Delphi, and accordingly we must regard it as adventitious at Athens. As Apollo based his defence of Orestes on the ground that he was justified in slaying his mother to avenge his father, it would appear that trials of those who pleaded justification for their shedding of blood, such as those who had slain an adulterer taken in the act, or those who had slain others in self-defence, as in the mythical case of Theseus, were associated with this shrine, because Apollo was supposed to have first laid down at Athens in the case of Orestes the principle that intentional homicide could be justified.

¹ *Ath. Pol.* c. 57.

² viii. 125.

³ *Eum.* 465: κρίνασα δ' ἀστῶν τῶν ἐμῶν τὰ βέλτατα.

Let us now turn to the court of the Palladion. (1) Here stood the most ancient image of which we have any account in Athens. According to the legend given by Pausanias (*l.c.*) 'after the capture of Ilium Diomedes was sailing homeward, and night having fallen when they arrived off Phalerum, the Argives disembarked, as in an enemy's country, taking it in the dark for some land other than Attica. Hereupon Demophon being also unaware that the men from the ships were Argives came out against them and slew some of them, and carried off the Palladion.' Another legend says that the image had fallen from heaven upon the hill of Ate, whilst still another story says that Athena slew her playmate Pallas and erected an image of her. The Palladion had closed eyes, and was a type essentially different from that of the statues of Athena.

(2) Each year the Ephebi carried the image out of its shrine to Phalerum to the sea and back again with torches and every form of pomp.¹ The Nomophylakes marshalled the procession.² Doubtless the image was taken down to the sea to be laved in the sea-water, in order to remove the pollution which during the previous year it might have contracted from the embraces of those who, like Orestes, had taken refuge and embraced it in their arms. That the object in bringing the statue down to the sea was to wash it from all impurity is rendered clear by the passage in the *Iphigeneia in Tauris*,³ where Iphigeneia effects the escape of Orestes, Pylades, and herself by telling Thoas the Tauric king that it was necessary to purify the image of Artemis from the miasma of Orestes and Pylades not by fresh water, but by sea-water, 'for the sea washes away all human pollution.' We need therefore have no doubt that the Palladion was used from time immemorial as a sanctuary in which those whose

hands were red with human blood took refuge. (3) In it sat the Ephetae, who had once sat even on the Areopagus until Solon had replaced them by a body of exarchons.

(4) There is not the slightest evidence that trials for deliberate murder ever took place here, for they would seem from their first institution to have been held on the Areopagus. Of course it may be said, if the trials for wilful murder were held from the first on that famous spot, then that must have been the oldest court for homicide, since deliberate murder was the most serious offence, and for it a tribunal would be first erected. But this is a complete misconception of the evolution of the law of trial for murder at Athens and in many other places. We are told by Aeschylus⁴, and Pausanias (*supra*) repeats the same tradition that in old days at Athens prevailed the stern rule, that whoso had shed man's blood, whether accidentally, justifiably, or wilfully, should be slain, even as he slew.

This was exactly the same doctrine as that held by the Semites on the other side of the Mediterranean. Amongst the latter we have the clearest proof that the first step in any modification of the custom by which the avenger of blood was permitted to kill the manslayer, no matter whether the latter had slain his victim by accident or design, was the establishment of sanctuaries. Such were the six cities of Refuge enjoined by Jehovah through the mouth of Moses. 'That the manslayer may flee thither, which killeth any person at unawares (*ἀκουσίως*). They shall be unto you cities of refuge from the avenger; that the manslayer die not, until he stand before the congregation in judgment.'⁵ If he could show that he had shed blood unwittingly, he was spared and there he dwelt until the death of the High Priest at Jerusalem. It will be observed that the manslayer was tried at the asylum where he had taken refuge, not brought somewhere else to be tried. This was but natural, seeing that if he once quitted his

¹ *C.I.A.* ii. 469, 10: ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἐφηβοὶ . . . ἐξήγαγον δὲ καὶ τὴν Παλλάδα κακείθεν πάλιν συνεισήγαγον μετὰ φωτὸς, μετὰ πάσης εὐκοσμίας (cf. *C.I.A.* ii. 471, 11).

² Suidas, p. 1273: οἱ δὲ νομοφύλακες τῇ Παλλάδι τὴν πομπὴν ἐκόσμουον ὅτε κομίζοιτο τὸ ξόανον ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.

³ Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 1193: κλύζει θάλασσα πάντα τὰνθρώπων κακὰ. Cf. Farnell, *Cults of Greek States*, vol. i. p. 304.

⁴ *Choeph.* 305: δρᾶσαντι παθεῖν
τριγέρων μῦθος τάδε φωνεῖ.

⁵ *Numbers*, xxxv. 11-13: πᾶς ὁ πατάξας ψυχὴν ἀκουσίως (LXX).

sanctuary he was liable to be slain by the avenger at any moment. The Semitic practice gives us the clue to the various steps in the evolution of the law of homicide at Athens. Here as in Palestine the ancient custom was that the slayer should be slain. As the first relaxation of this merciless rule was the establishment of an asylum for those who had unwittingly shed blood, so we are justified in assuming that when at Athens we find distinct tribunals for different kinds of homicide, involuntary, justifiable, and deliberate, the first named (*i.e.* the Palladion) must have been the oldest, that for deliberate murder (the Areopagus) the last, that for justifiable (the Delphinion), the second, but this is exactly what Aeschylus assumes, for he represents that the first tribunal for homicide was established for cases where extenuating circumstances were alleged—Orestes himself pleading that he had committed the crime under the compulsion of Apollo, Apollo urging that Orestes was justified in killing his mother to avenge his father. In other words Aeschylus represents the first tribunal as instituted for both the classes of homicide which in historical times were divided between the Court of the Palladion and that of the Delphinion. But this is only what might have been expected, for the first step in the amelioration of the law of vengeance would be in the case of those who had killed unawares, the second would be the feeling that a man, even though he slew deliberately, might be justified in so doing. Naturally those who first urged the latter plea took refuge at the ancient sanctuary whither resorted those who had slain a man unawares; and it would be only later that a separate court would be established for the second class of extenuating circumstances.

But this is completely in accordance with the statement of Aeschylus, for the court first established to try homicide was held at a sanctuary which contained a most ancient image of Pallas. But as it was at the court of the Palladion that trials for involuntary homicide were tried, there can be little doubt that the court of the Palladion was older than that of the Delphinion. Moreover, as the name Delphinion shows, that Shrine was of

comparatively recent origin, and as its connection with justifiable homicide apparently arose from the belief that Apollo had first broached that doctrine at Athens in the case of Orestes, we must conclude that it was of more recent date than the Palladion.

Let us now turn to the remaining claimant, the Areopagus. How does it fit the conditions of the case? (1) There was there no ancient image called by the name of either Athena or Pallas, for Pausanias only mentions a statue of Athena Promachos on the Hill of Ares. (2) There is not the slightest evidence that any other form of homicide except deliberate murder was ever tried there. (3) It is only as the last step in the evolution of the law of homicide that the community steps in between the next of kin and the deliberate manslayer, and insists that a solemn inquiry into the facts of the case shall be carried out before the accused shall be put to death. Accordingly the court of the Areopagus comes latest in the process of legal evolution. That court therefore fails as completely as the Delphinion to fulfil the required conditions, whereas the Palladion, as has just been shown, is in strict accord with all the requirements of the play. For it had an immemorial *xoanon*, used as a place of sanctuary by manslaughterers, and this was never called by any other name than that of Pallas or Palladion, whilst in its precincts was held the court for the trial of involuntary homicide which we have just seen was the first stage in the mitigation of the ancient pitiless rule of a life for a life.

In the first attempt to mitigate the severity of the antique law the king and his council of elders would naturally be the body who would decide whether a particular manslayer had shed blood involuntarily or justifiably. I have already pointed out that the Fifty and One consisting of the Basileus Archon and fifty others chosen for their high birth look like the survival of the ancient king and Gerontes or Boule. The Basileus laid the case before the court (*eiráyetei*) as Athena does in the play. Aeschylus evidently believed that the first trial for homicide took place before the ancient Boule, for otherwise he would not have represented it as taking place in a Council chamber

(βουλευτήριον).¹ Whilst it is very likely that in ancient times the king decided all ordinary cases himself, as did the Egyptian kings, and as is perhaps implied in the tradition preserved in Pollux, yet in cases of bloodshed the king would have felt like Athena in the play, and held that such cases were too serious to be tried by any one individual, whether mortal or immortal, and accordingly he laid (είσήγαγε) the matter before the Boule.

If it be urged that although Orestes took sanctuary at the Palladion, nevertheless he was tried on the Areopagus, and in support of this contention it be said that the words *πάγον δ' Ἄρειον τόνδ' Ἀμαζόνων ἔδραν* refer to the spot where the trial is proceeding, it may be at once pointed out that *τόνδε* is simply used *δεικτικῶς*, as is so often the case ('yon Hill of Ares'), for the reference to the Areopagus is only secondary, having been introduced by Aeschylus, as is commonly held, in order to support the Areopagites against the democratic legislation of Pericles and Ephialtes.

But there are several grave objections to this view. In the first place, it has already been pointed out (*supra*) that it was in the very essence of an asylum that the manslayer should remain there until it had been decided whether he could plead extenuating circumstances or not. If Orestes had been removed from the Palladion to be tried on the Hill of Ares, he would have been exposed to the vengeance of the Furies as soon as he had quitted the Palladion. Again, if the trial took place on the Areopagus, it is strange there should be no reference to the two famous unhewn stones of Anaideia and Hybris, on which stood the accuser and the accused respectively. Furthermore, at the close of the play Athena declares that she will send the Erinyes by torchlight to the cavernous recesses beneath the earth under the conduct of her attendants who guard her *bretas*, whilst the best born of all the land of Theseus shall

come, a goodly company of maidens, married women, and aged matrons. It seems very unlikely that Athenian women would be represented as present on the Areopagus during the trial, and ready to form a procession. Moreover, there is no reason why the attendants of Athena who had charge of her ancient image, should be present at a spot where there was no shrine of the goddess, and no ancient image known either as Pallas or Athena. On the other hand, if the procession started from the Palladion, moving from south-east to the Areopagus, the attendants of Athena will naturally be ready to escort the Furies, now clad in scarlet like Metics (as Dr. Headlam has cleverly shown) to their future abode in the side of the Areopagus. Moreover, the words *εὐφαιμίτε δέ, χωρίται* (989) and *εὐφαιμίτε δὲ πανδαμί* (991) have no force, if we hold that the procession is simply moving down from the top of the hill to the cavern in its side, for why should all the Athenians be present? On the other hand if the procession is passing across the lower town from the Palladion to the Areopagus, then the exhortation to the whole population to observe a religious silence is completely in place. Finally, if the procession moved from the court on the Areopagus down the hill to the cavern in its side, we ought naturally to meet some word or phrase, in the marshalling of the procession, to signify that it was descending the side of the hill. But no such word as *καταβαίνειν* occurs, but simply *προβάτε* and *βάτε*.

We have now compared the claims of the Erechtheum with those of the three chief courts for the trial of homicide, and we have found that the former fails to satisfy any of the necessary conditions. But as the Areopagus and Delphinion also fail in all respects except that they were tribunals for homicide, whereas the Palladion fulfils them all, we may conclude that the scene of the asylum and trial of Orestes is to be laid at the Palladion.

WILLIAM RIDGEWAY.

¹ *Εισι.* 540: πληρουμένου γὰρ τοῦδε βουλευτηρίου.

NOMEN OMEN.

Δύναται δὲ κατὰ Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ταῦτα τὰ οὐνόματα Δαρείος ἐρέϊς, Ξέρξης ἀρήϊος, Ἀρταξέρξης μέγας ἀρήϊος. τοὺτους μὲν δὴ τοὺς βασιλέας ὥδε ἂν ὀρθῶς κατὰ γλῶσσαν τὴν σφετέρην Ἕλληνες καλέοιεν.—Herodotos 6. 98.

It saute aux yeux and still more aux oreilles that we ought to read: Δαρείος ἀρήϊος, Ξέρξης ἐρέϊς, Ἀρταξέρξης κάρτα ἐρέϊς. And reflection confirms the changes. For why should Herodotos have used the excessively rare word ἐρέϊς,¹ unless he wished to bring

¹ *Et. mag.* 376, 52 ff. 'Ἐρέϊας: ὄνομα κύριον. παρὰ τὸ ῥέζω ῥέζω, ῥεζίας: ὑπερβιβασμῶ ἔρεϊας, ὁ πρακτικός: ὁμοίως τῷ ἐρέκτης, ἔρεκτης. Cod. Vossianus (V.) adds a quotation from an anonymous poet cited by Hephaest. 6. 2: ἐρέϊ πῇ δ' αὐτ' ἀνολβος ἀθροίζεται στρατός. Bergk prints this as Archiloch. frag. 60 'Ἐρέϊη, πῇ δὲντ' ἀνολβος ἀθροίζεται στρατός; and Consbruch in his 1906 ed. of Hephaestion follows suit. But it may well be a quotation from the lost version of Aischylos' *Persai* (schol. Ar. ran. 1028) or from Phrynichos' *Phoinissai*, in which case 'Ἐρέϊς will be the Hellenised form of Ξέρξης, and my argument will be materially strengthened.

out what he took to be the obvious etymology of Ξέρξης? And is it mere coincidence that ἀρήϊος is related to Δαρείος precisely as ἐρέϊς to Ξέρξης? That Δαρείος ἀρήϊος, Ξέρξης ἐρέϊς should have been corrupted into Δαρείος ἐρέϊς, Ξέρξης ἀρήϊος will surprise no student of palaeography, or indeed of human nature—witness the Tongan myth about the origin of tattooing.² And, when once the words had been wrongly coupled, the change of Ἀρταξέρξης . . . ἐρέϊς into Ἀρταξέρξης . . . ἀρήϊος was inevitable. How κάρτα became μέγας, I am not prepared to say: but, if the scholiast on Eur. *Hipp.* 90 thought it worth his while to explain the poet's καὶ κάρτα γε by καὶ λίαν or καὶ πάνυ or καὶ μάλιστα, it seems possible that μέγας was a gloss on the historian's κάρτα.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

² E. B. Tylor *Primitive Culture*,² London 1891 i. 393.

HIPPOKLEIDES' DANCE.

HIPPOKLEIDES, by way of outshining all other competitors for the hand of the fair Agariste, bade some one bring in a table. And '—I give the words of Herodotos¹—'when the table came in, he danced upon it first of all sundry *Laconian* figures, secondly *Attic* figures too, and in the third place'. . . . Here I pause. Suppose that at this point there had been a lacuna in the text of the historian: we should all have filled it up with some such conjectural reading as this—'and in the third place certain *Theban* figures.' For after Sparta comes Athens, and after Athens what but Thebes? Hence, when Herodotos continues—'and in the third place he put his head down on the table and waved in the air with his legs,' it is tempting to suppose that this was no school-boy freak, but a definite dance probably of Theban origin.

¹ Hdt. 6. 129.

I had long been convinced that Hippokleides' apparent prank was in reality a recognised, if not a ritual, performance, when it occurred to me that as such it might be aptly illustrated by the vase-fragment here reproduced.² This fragment came from the site of the Kabeirion at Thebes and is part of a *pella* of local fabric, referable to the end of the fifth century B.C.³ or perhaps to the beginning of the fourth. The class of ware to which it belongs is hieratic in character and stood in some relation to the cult of the Kabeiros, who at Thebes was distinctly Dionysiac.⁴ The subjects portrayed on the ware are usually caricatures or grotesque

² From the *Mittheil. d. k. d. arch. Inst. : athen. Abtheil.* 1888 xiii. 425 fig. 17.

³ C. Smith in the *J. H. S.* 1890 xi. 348.

⁴ H. Winnefeld in the *Athen. Mittheil.* 1888 xiii. 414 ff., H. B. Walters *History of Ancient Pottery*, London 1905 i. 52 f., 391 f., ii. 159 f.

representations of mythical episodes, scenes of flute-playing, dancing, hunting, etc. Our fragment depicts on the right a seated or reclining figure, wearing a *himation*, and probably to be identified with the Kabeiros himself¹; on the left, a man clad in a *himation* and leaning on a knotted staff; and between them a three-legged table, on which a nude (?) man is resting his hands, while he kicks up his heels so as to turn a somersault or dance on his head. In the *Classical Review* for 1895² I published another cup from the same site, which likewise represented a man dancing on a three-legged table—clearly a quasi-dramatic per-

legged table of the Kabeirion, through (2) the three-legged, four-legged, five-legged, etc. platforms of the *φλύακες* as figured on South Italian vases,³ up to (3) the architectural pillared *hyposkenion* at Epidauros. However that may be, the tumbler's dance⁴ depicted on our vase-fragment must certainly have been part of the Kabeiric ritual at Thebes. And I infer that Hippokleides, after showing the astonished company how they footed it at Sparta and at Athens, ended his variety entertainment (and his hopes of Agariste) by this shameless Theban turn.⁵ When with a final flourish of his heels he exclaimed *ὁ φροντὶς Ἰπποκλείδῃ*, he surely did not mean



formance before a god resembling Dionysos *Δενδρίτης*; and I endeavoured to show that the table or table-altar (*τράπεζα*,⁶ *ἐλεός*⁴) served as the primitive stage. Indeed it would be easy to trace the whole evolution of the Greek dramatic stage from (1) the three-

'Hippokleides doesn't care!': that would have been *οὐδὲν μέλει μοι*. Rather he trolled a few trochaic words appropriate to his festive fling: 'Hippokleides has no cares!' Kleisthenes was perhaps unjust when he treated these Kabeiric capers as a proof of indecorous levity. But posterity is still more so, if it mistakes light-heartedness for downright impudence.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

¹ Cp. the reclining *ΚΑΒΙΡΟΣ* in the *Athen. Mittheil.* 1888 xiii. pl. 9.

² *C.R.* 1895 ix. 373.

³ *Et. mag.* 458, 30 ff. s.v. *θυμέλη*, ἡ τοῦ θεάτρου μέχοι νῦν ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης ἀνόμεσται, παρὰ τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῆς τὰ θύη μερίζεσθαι, τουνέστι τὰ θυόμενα ἱερεῖα. *τράπεζα* δὲ ἦν, ἐφ' ἧς ἐστῶτες ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς ᾤδον, μήπω τάξιν λαβοῦσης τραγῳδίας. *Orion* 72, 8 ff. s.v. *θυμέλη* reads *τράπεζα* δὲ ἦν πρὸ τούτου, ἐφ' ἧς κ.τ.λ.

⁴ *Poll.* 4. 123 *ἐλεός* δ' ἦν *τράπεζα* ἀρχαία, ἐφ' ἣν πρὸ θεόπιδος εἰς τις ἀναβὰς τοῖς χορευταῖς ἀπεκρίνατο.

⁵ *J.H.S.* Supplementary vol. i. (*Megalopolis*) 96 ff.

⁶ *Poll.* 4. 105 *τραγικῆς ὀρχήσεως σχήματα* include *κυβίστησις*.

⁷ *Zenob.* 5. 31 with the passages collected by Leutsch and Schneidewin *ad loc.*

LUCRETIUS II. 355 sqq.

at mater viridis saltus orbata peragrans
 nonquit humi pedibus vestigia pressa
 bisulcis,
 omnia convicens oculis loca si queat usquam
 conspiciere amissum fetum, completque
 querellis
 frondiferum nemus.

Nonquit O : oinquit Q : linquit Q corr. :
 noscit Lachm. : novit Brieger.

Noscit is read by Munro and Giussani, but it is hard to see why such a common word should have been corrupted. The whole passage is very closely imitated by Ovid *Fast.* 4. 459 sqq. 'Ut vitulo mugit sua mater ab ubere raptō Et quaerit fetus per nemus omne suos . . . Inde puellaris nacta est vestigia plantae Et pressam noto pondere vidit humum : Quacumque ingreditur miseris loca cuncta querellis Implet.' The use of nacta est in this passage of Ovid suggests

that the corruption in the text of Lucretius was due to the use of *nancit*, the archaic form of *nanciscitur*. For the form *nancio* cf. the fragment of Gracchus, quoted by Priscian (i. 513), Si nanciam populi desiderium, comprobabo reipublicae commoda. We also find the deponent form *nancior* in the fragments of the XII Tables (Wordsworth, *Fragments and Specimens*, p. 264). *Nacta est* occurs in 2. 872, and *nactae sunt* in 4. 1252, but Lucretius employs archaic and normal forms indifferently, e.g. *sonere*, *sonare* : *cupiret*, *cuperet* : *potestur*, *potest* : *fuat*, *sit* : *escit*, *erit* : *vis* (pl.), *vires* : *noenu*, *non* : *suppus*, *supinus* : *sublimus*, *sublimis*.

If *nancit* were the original reading, it would be certain to be corrupted, and there is no more common confusion in the MSS. of *Lucr.* than that of *c* and *qu*.

GEORGE W. MOONEY.

REVIEWS

GREEK CULTS.

The Cults of the Greek States. By LEWIS RICHARD FARNELL, D.Litt., M.A., F.A.S. Vols. III. and IV. Oxford : Clarendon Press, Henry Frowde. 1907. 8vo. 2 vols. III. = pp. xii + 394 ; IV. = pp. viii + 454. 86 plates. 32s. net.

THESE two volumes amply maintain the position which Dr. Farnell won for himself as the leading authority on Greek religion by the first two volumes. They are marked by the same exhaustive knowledge of the original sources and the views of modern writers, power of clear and vigorous expression, and sanity of judgment.

A characteristic example of Dr. Farnell's method may be seen in his treatment of the legend of the Phigaleian Demeter and the Thelpusan Erinyes (iii, 50-62). To avoid

the pursuit of Poseidon, Demeter assumed the form of a mare ; the god then took the form of a stallion and begat on her the horse Arcion and a daughter, Despoina. The Phigaleians had a legend of a horse-headed temple-image of the goddess. Possibly these facts may point to an old worship of the horse as such, comparable with the worship of the cow and snake in India, and Mr. Cook has seen traces of such cults in the Mycenaean age (*J.H.S.*, 1894). But Greece presents no clear example of such worship, and Dr. Farnell therefore rejects this view. He also rejects the explanation that the horse is a chthonian animal and so connected with the chthonian goddess, since the traces in Greek religion of the chthonian character of the horse are vague and scanty. On the analogy of the October horse at Rome it might be

held that the horse was an embodiment of the corn-spirit, but to this view Dr. Farnell objects that the horse in Greece was by no means an agricultural animal and was never offered in sacrifice to any of the recognized vegetation deities. Finally the possibility of totemism is excluded by the fact that we have no record of a horse clan.

Dr. Farnell's own theory rests on the derivation of the cult from Boeotia, where Poseidon was worshipped as Hippios and was deemed to have been united with the earth-goddess. Demeter, or Erinys, may have taken over from him in some local cults and legends an equine form to enable her to become the mother of his horse progeny. Plausible as this explanation is, it involves rejecting the old comparison of the Greek legend with the story of Vivasvat and Saranyū in Vedic mythology. No doubt the equation of Erinys and Saranyū is philologically impossible, but names are of the least importance in legends, and, though the form in which the story has come down to us contains diverse elements, its main features have too many parallels in Vedic religion to allow us to accept the theory (i, 2) that the myth is a mere piece of aetiology. In both cases the salient facts are the flight of the goddess, the assumption of horse shapes, and the birth of horse progeny, in the one case Areion, in the other the Asvins, whose horsemanship no doubt reflects an earlier horse shape, just as the horses of the sun are originally the sun. The flight may be explained as a relic of marriage by capture, or, on the Vedic analogy of Yama and Yami, as signifying the difficulties felt by primitive man as to the marriage of the first pair. The assumption of animal forms is frequent in Vedic cosmogonic legends (see Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.*, xv, 178), perhaps because of the great fertility of certain animals or to explain the descent of animals from human beings.

Elsewhere, also, Dr. Farnell shows himself opposed to accepting totemism as an explanation of theriomorphism in cult or myth. In the case of Poseidon Hippios he adopts (iv, 22) the view that the horse was regarded as a symbol of water in the sense that the god, while remaining something

other than the symbol, yet temporarily is incarnate therein. He adopts a similar view in the case of Apollo Lykeios (iv, 116). Apollo is the god of the woods of a race of hunters and shepherds, and the fierce beast of the woods is readily regarded as an occasional incarnation. Or perhaps without accepting totemism we may regard this case as a survival of zoolatry, in view of the existence of the Hirpini and their wolf dance. Even Apollo Smintheus—assuming his Hellenic character—does not prove totemism (iv, 256), for there is no record of a mouse-tribe or of the sacramental eating of mice. Probably Apollo as agricultural deity was deemed responsible for field mice, and mice might sometimes be propitiated, like the mouse-king in a Vedic ritual (see Hillebrandt, *Rituallitteratur*, p. 85).

Nor is Dr. Farnell disposed to assign great prominence to the sacramental meal in which the worshippers partake of the body of the slain god. He does not find that any such sacrament formed part of the Eleusinia (iii, 184), and indeed even those cases in which he recognizes the phenomenon as perhaps present (iv, 258) seem to us open to a simpler explanation than one which assumes that the worshippers regarded themselves as partaking of the body of a slain god. As Dr. Farnell himself points out, the Greeks from Homeric times were familiar with the form of sacrament which consists in the god and the worshippers feasting on the victim, and thus becoming so far of the same flesh. But further it must be remembered that, when the victim is offered, the deity is conceived as coming to consume it, and the presence of the divinity at the altar and his mystic feeding on the victim fill its body with his spirit. So a victim which before the sacrifice was not regarded as divine may become in the course of the sacrifice by the entrance of the deity so filled with the divine spirit that the contact of its flesh or blood or skin conveys holiness, as in the case of the *δωωτήρ* at Delphi, and that the worshippers may feel that they are obtaining closer union with the god than could be gained by merely eating the same food with the god. Such cases may have been the goat sacrifice at the Laconian

Kop
phon
pigs
by th
as in
an e
case
of a
sacri
scho
is no
by t
been
for s
Pose
ceive
god,
be n
ceres
simil
sacri
Bou
of fu
eatin
relig
earli
Such
the
in th
Attis
wors
find
is at
find
Pr
parti
the g
relig
the v
have
they
Indi
earth
abori
their
of th
wors
or ev
Fraz
able.
cond
less

Kopides, and the eating at the Thesmophoria of the remains of the flesh of the pigs offered to Demeter and partly consumed by the snakes, which no doubt were regarded as incarnations of the earth-goddess (iii, 90) an example of particular interest. In all these cases there is no need to assume the slaying of a god. More doubtful, perhaps, is the wolf sacrifice to Apollo at Argos referred to by the scholiast on Sophokles, *Elektra* 6. But there is no trace (iv, 255) of any eating of wolves by the worshippers, and the wolf may have been considered a particularly suitable animal for sacrifice to Apollo as was the horse for Poseidon, inasmuch as it was sometimes conceived as the temporary incarnation of the god, and its strength would by the sacrifice be magically transferred to him. Or again, its ceremonial sacrifice may be due to reasons similar to those which move the Ainus in sacrificing the bear (cf. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*,² ii, 389). Indeed it seems worthy of further inquiry whether the conception of eating the slain god belongs to Hellenic religion or is due to borrowing from the earlier inhabitants of the Mediterranean area. Such borrowing appears clear in the case of the Mother of the Gods (iii, 295), and it is in the myths connected with her spouses, Attis and Adonis, and in the partially foreign worships of Dionysos and Aphrodite, that we find stress laid on the death of the god. It is at any rate worth noting that it is hard to find any parallel ideas in Vedic religion.

Probably it was to foreign sources and in particular to the worship of Rhea that is due the great prominence of goddesses in Greek religion. There are no doubt goddesses in the Vedic pantheon, and the Hellenes must have brought female deities with them when they entered Greece, but just as the Vedic Indians gradually took over the worship of the earth-goddess as a great divinity from the aborigines, so, it seems, did the Greeks graft their goddesses upon the great mother-goddess of the Mediterranean people. But from this worship to ascribe matriarchy to the Greeks or even to the pre-Hellenic stocks, as do Dr. Frazer and Miss Harrison, is utterly unjustifiable. If women were solely charged with the conduct of the Thesmophoria, that was doubtless due, as Dr. Farnell points out (iii, 111),

to their peculiar sensitiveness to religious ecstasy and their consequent greater power of working magic to promote the growth of the crops.

While, however, such speculations must remain doubtful, we need not hesitate to recognize the value of the evidence produced by Dr. Farnell as to the relations of the Hellenic tribes. For ethnological purposes it is now recognized that myths are useless, and that the evidence of cult alone deserves much consideration. When we find that Poseidon Hippios (iv, 23) was specially connected with the Thessalian Minyae, among whom the ταυροκαθάψια appears to have developed into a religious rite, we may fairly use the diffusion of the cult as a trace of Minyan influence. Still more important is the case of Poseidon Helikonios. The word cannot possibly be derived from Helike, and Dr. Farnell (iv, 32) rightly sees in it a proof of an old Ionian worship of Poseidon at Helikon at a time when the Ionians and the Minyae dwelt together in Boeotia. Later, pressure from the north drove the Ionians south into Attica, the Argolid and Achaea. In Attica itself the cults of Poseidon and Apollo enable us to trace various streams of Hellenic migration (iv, 48, 156). As against Miss Harrison, Dr. Farnell conclusively proves that Erechtheus cannot be identified with Poseidon, but is the old hero of Athens, who with Athene, Zeus, and Hephaistos, makes up the gods of the first Hellenic settlement. From the tetrapolis was introduced into Athens the cult of Apollo as Patroos and Pythios by Ionians, and the legend of Ion was gradually accepted, though Apollo never won his way into the circle of divinities of the phratric ritual. Later came Poseidon with a new Ionian migration from Troezen, and his worship seems to have been strengthened by a settlement of Minyae. Of even greater ethnographic significance is the cult of Apollo Lykeios (iv, 113). The evidence of Homer must be deemed conclusive for the early presence of Hellenes in Lycia, and the name itself appears to be Greek. It can hardly be doubted that the Greek migration took place *viâ* Crete, and it is at least very probable that the Ruka of the Egyptian monuments

of Rameses II. are the Lycians, so that we obtain some evidence of weight that Hellenic settlement had taken place in Crete by the fifteenth century B.C., a result of great importance for the early ethnology of the Aegean.

Of the great festivals connected with the cults dealt with in these volumes, the most interesting are the Thesmophoria (iii, 75-112), the Eleusinia (iii, 126-198), and the Thargelia (iv, 268-284). Dr. Farnell proves conclusively that the Thesmophoria had nothing to do with laws or marriage, but was a rite intended to further human and animal fertility, as the women's ceremonial march with torches and the ritual *αἰσχρολογία* would be sufficient to show. His interpretation of *θεσμοφόρος* as 'the bringer of treasure or riches' (iii, 106) is attractive and probable. In the case of the Eleusinia he rejects Dr. Jevons' theory of the sacramental meal of corn, and M. Foucart's attempt to resolve it into an analogue of the Book of the Dead. The former theory seems, indeed, impossible in view of the silence of Iamblichos in his attack in the *De Mysteriis* on the gift theory of sacrifice, and the latter theory confuses the private Orphic mysteries with the Eleusinian cult. The religious power of the Eleusinia appears, indeed, from the old notices, to have rested in the main on the spectacle with its striking allegory of life and death. The Thargelia, on the other hand, takes us back to a very primitive stage of ideas. The human victims there offered combined in themselves the functions of scapegoats and the decaying deity of vegetation. But in view of Dr. Frazer's theory of the slain god, it is

worth noting that in the Attic festival no trace appears of any consciousness on the part of the worshippers that the victims were in any degree divine. So also, even if we admit, what is not very probable, that in the Karneia the priest once died in the ritual, yet we must agree with Dr. Farnell (iv, 284), that the idea of the ceremony was not pressed to the strained logical conclusion that in his death the god died also.

It must suffice merely to refer to Dr. Farnell's conclusive proof that Apollo is not a sun-god (iv, 136-143), to his development of Ahrens' theory of the original meaning of *ὑπερβόρειοι* as *ὑπέρφοροι*, the sacred ministrants who carried the cereal offerings from one community to another (iv, 100-104), to the proof from cult-titles of the very early date of the Aeolic migration (iv, 169), to the interesting chapter on the cults of Hades (iii, 280-288), and to the note on the existence of the conception of a virgin mother (iii, 305, 306). Most important for the history of Greek morality is the section on the influence of Delphi (iv, 202, *seq.*), and, for the history of art, the chapters on the cult monuments and the ideal types of Demeter, Apollo, and Poseidon.

It is intended to complete the work next year by the issue of a volume dealing with the worship of Dionysos, Hermes, and minor deities, while the same or another volume will deal with hero-worship; and we venture to congratulate Dr. Farnell on the approaching completion of a treatise which is indispensable to every student of religion, history, and art.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

PLAYS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Frogs of Aristophanes. Edited by T. G. TUCKER. Macmillan, 1906. Pp. lix + 276. 3s. 6d.

The Birds of Aristophanes. Edited by B. B. ROGERS. Bell, 1906. Pp. xcii + 305. 10s. 6d.

Mr. TUCKER'S *Frogs* is an excellent school edition, and more than that, full of knowledge and judiciously done. He is equally careful to dwell on the meanings of words, to bring out points of Greek syntax, to set forth the rules of the metres, what is known as to the

antiquities, what is guessed as to the jokes. The Introduction takes first 'the date and motives' of the play, then proceeds to maintain that the 'mysteries' more or less embodied in it are the lesser Mysteries of Athens, not the Greater Mysteries of Eleusis. Here may be recognised an article contributed by him to Vol. xviii of this *Review*. There follow two sections on the language and metres of comedy and on 'some features of the comic style,' which young Aristophanists will find extremely serviceable, and a concluding section on the text. The commentary is copious and to the point, even if it does not always recommend itself to the reader's judgment. It contains a considerable amount of new matter in the way of suggestions for explaining, occasionally even for emending, the text, though in textual matters the editor is as a rule conservative. I am sorry that in 83 he puts forward anything so fanciful as ἀπολιπὼν μ' ὁ-ίχεται, on the model of W. G. Clark's unhappy βρετερέτας in *Knights* 32. In 957 his conjecture ἔρην (for ἐρᾶν) τεχνάζειν may be right, though in 1028 ἐχάρην γοῶν ἦνίκα γ' ἦν εἰκοῖς πέρι is assuredly not so, and his small changes in 1130 (οὐδὲ πάντα γ' ἐστὶ ταῦτ') and 1305 (τοῦτον for τοῦτον) seem improvements. 320 he adopts the variant δι' ἀγορᾶς for the common Διαγοράς, 168 he understands ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται to mean 'is on that errand,' i.e. to visit Hades. There is however no mention of Hades anywhere in the immediate context and τοῦτο should refer to τὰ στρώματα λαμβάνειν. 685 he will hardly upset the usual translation of κἂν ἴσαι γίνονται in favour of 'even if fair terms are got.' 790 he fails to do justice to the difficulty of making ἐκεῖνος refer to Sophocles (κάκεῖνος ὑπεχώρησεν). 607 (οὐκ ἐς κόρακας μὴ πρόσιτον) the idea that ἐς κόρακας is a curse by the way needs better parallels. 891 ἰδῶται θεοί and 459 ἰδιώτας still remain strange. 1114 I concur in thinking a book of the words improbable, but a 'book of military exercises and tactics' seems improbable too as an explanation. 1055 it is surely wrong to condemn the ordinary translation of ἔστι διδάσκαλος ὅστις φράζει, ὅστις being due to ἔστι (ἔστιν ὅστις).

The *Birds* is another part of B. B. Rogers'

many-volumed and much appreciated *Aristophanes* with text and commentary and critical notes and verse translation complete. It is indeed remarkable that two old Oxford men, not divided by more than ten or twelve years of University standing, should have independently taken in hand, and now one may say achieved, so big a piece of work as the respective editions of Blaydes and Rogers. In the preface of the new part not less than sixty pages are devoted to identifying the various birds mentioned in the play and to the classical lore belonging to them, evidently a labour of love. The editor argues from certain details that the play was taken in hand soon after the composition of the *Peace*, or at least while Aristophanes had the *Peace* and its contents very fresh in memory, although seven years elapsed between their respective first performances. The preface also contains a long note by that high authority, Mr. Christopher Welch, on the music of the αἰλός as representing the song of the nightingale. In text and notes Mr. Rogers is, as usual, tenacious of tradition. He will not even allow us to alter *Peisthetaerus* to a more plausible form. In various passages usually regarded now as corrupt he is satisfied with the reading of the MSS. In 16 for instance he explains ὅς ὄρνις ἐγένετ' ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων as a jocose reference to plumage obtained from the bird-market, as though the metamorphosis of Tereus were a mere pretence. But of this there is no sort of hint elsewhere in the play, and it is likely enough that ἐκ τῶν ὄ is an accidental repetition from 13, where the words occur in the same part of the line. In 167 foll. Mr. Rogers clings again to the traditional words (τοὺς πετομένους κ.τ.λ.), though one knows that he would never have written anything so awkward himself. In a note of considerable length he defends 753-4 against what I had to say about it in *C.R.* xv. 388, but I venture to think the defence insufficient, especially as it takes no account of the fact that on his view the ἡμᾶς of 754 are not the ἡμῶν of 756 and 758: 'if anyone would like to live with birds (in general), let him come to us (in particular), for with birds (in general)' etc. On the other hand his citation of *Theogony* 116 and 127 satisfies me that 701 is right

and *γένετο* practically a quotation from Hesiod. 725 he suggests *ἦρος ἐν ὥραις* for *αἰῶραις ὥραις*: 777 puts a comma after *ποικίλα*, understanding *φύλα* with it (is this good Greek?): and 718 makes (in his translation) *γάμον ἀνδρός* mean a friend's marriage, which the general drift will hardly allow. 1681 he retains *βαδίζειν* 'let us migrate hence, like the swallows'; but is migration at all apposite to the topic of *Basileia*?

Mr. Rogers' translation of the parabasis will as a whole hold its own with others, though it has nothing quite so good as the first few lines of Frere's. But no translation that I know of is very satisfactory. Even Mr. Swinburne's hand, if one may say so, here loses something of its cunning. I quote the beginning of Mr. Rogers' rendering:

Ye men who are dimly existing below, who
perish and fade as the leaf,
Pale, woebegone, shadowlike, spiritless folk,
life feeble and wingless and brief,

Frail castings in clay, who are gone in a day,
like a dream full of sorrow and sighing,
Come listen with care to the Birds of the
air, the ageless, the deathless, who flying
In the joy and the freshness of Ether are
wont to muse upon wisdom undying.

We will tell you of things transcendental; of
Springs and of Rivers the mighty up-
heaval;

The nature of Birds; and the birth of the
Gods; and of Chaos and Darkness
primeval.

When this ye shall know, let old Prodicus
go and be hanged without hope of
reprieve.

The anapaestic exposition 462 foll. is well rendered, as are the trochaics of the parodos scene, the choral lyrics that rather mechanically separate the later episodes, and the songs of the hoopoe.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ROME AND GREECE.

Rome et la Grèce de 200 à 146 avant Jésus-Christ. Par G. COLIN. Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. 8vo. Pp. 684. Paris: Fontemoing, 1905. Fr. 16.

THIS book is practically a history of Philhellenism among the Romans. It is curious that there should have been such a divergence of opinion on this subject. Mommsen attributes all the Roman dealings with Greece to a love of ideal justice, not to say to a naïve sentimentality; Duruy supposes the Romans to have followed from the beginning a Machiavellian policy of hypocrisy and greed; Hertzberg thinks that they started with good intentions, which gradually changed to a programme of selfish conquest. M. Colin sets himself the task of finding out the truth about Philhellenism. In this he has succeeded. Moreover, his results are presented in so attractive a form and style, that the book may be recom-

mended for the pleasure of the reading as much as for its historic worth. The only criticism I would make is that it is a little too long.

The conclusion to which the author comes is that Philhellenism was a force that grew, developed, decayed, revived. This fact, apparently so simple, he has been the first to grasp properly. It is impossible to reduce the whole of Roman policy towards Greece to one single formula. Attempts to do so end in confusion and contradiction, simply because the conduct of the Romans varied at different times. M. Colin distinguishes three periods—those of Flamininus, of Cato, and of Scipio Aemilianus. During the first, the Romans, intoxicated by the charm of Hellenic civilization, which they were just beginning to know, showed a most marked favouritism to the Greeks in their political dealings: this is the great period of flourishing Philhellenism. Unfortunately a closer acquaintance with the lamentable state

of contemporary Greece brought about a rapid disillusionment, and from the beginning of the Aetolo-Syrian till after the third Macedonian War, harshness, selfishness, and contempt were the dominant notes in the Roman policy. The very violence of this reaction in turn led to a revival of Philhellenism, but in a critical and subdued spirit, and so it continued to exist. M. Colin has cleverly pointed out how the Romans were both rapidly disillusioned, and while retaining their admiration for the literature and art of Greece—in fact for the whole of her past history—they consequently had a very wholesome contempt for the actual Greeks whom they met. On the cover of the book there stand the damning words addressed by Caesar to the Athenians: 'ποσάκις δὲ ὑμᾶς ὑπὸ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολλυμένους ἢ δόξα τῶν προγόνων περισώσει;' (App. B. c. II. 88.)

M. Colin brings forward the idea that Rome systematically separated Macedonia and the Asiatic Greeks from the European Greeks, and that only to the latter did she accord such especially favourable treatment. The evidence, however, does not seem particularly strong. For instance, it is not true that Rome inflicted the same treatment on Carthage and on Philip (p. 73). Carthage in 201 B.C. became a vassal-ally bound to furnish war vessels, as is clear from L. xxxvi. 4. 9, 42. 1. 2; xlii. 56. 6. 7. Philip was certainly under no obligation to furnish troops: it is possible to show that he was rather well treated by Rome after 196 B.C., probably owing to fear of Antiochus. One misses in this book a reference to the difficult, but important passage in L. xxxiii. 35. 4, which defines Philip's relations with Rome after Cynoscephalae.

M. Colin has been peculiarly successful in pointing out that Philhellenism flourished among the aristocracy and not among the plebs of Rome. At first the novelty of things Greek attracted all classes indiscriminately, but the lower classes never advanced far in the knowledge or the love of Hellenism, and most of their subsequent enlightenment filtered down to them through the aristocracy. If anything, the author has not pressed sufficiently far the gulf between nobles and

plebs. He represents the period after Zama as one of great military, commercial, and artistic activity. This is true—but only of the upper classes. Among the middle and lower classes it was one of the most profound exhaustion. Worn out by seventeen years of disastrous struggle, the mass of the Roman people emphatically vetoed any new fighting, and they were only persuaded by the Senate with the very greatest difficulty to pass the necessary decree for the second Macedonian War. M. Colin has not observed that the passing of this decree was only elicited from the Comitia by a bribe: it was conceded by the Senate that *only volunteers were to serve*.¹ L. xxxi. 8. 6: 'Sulpicio, cui novum ac magni nominis bellum decretum erat, permissum, ut de exercitu, quem P. Scipio ex Africa deportasset, voluntarios, quos posset, duceret; invitum ne quem militem veterem ducendi ius esset.' (Cf. xxxii. 3.) This explains the small number (6) of the legions raised in 200 B.C., a fact to which M. Colin himself draws attention. Moreover, he notices that only volunteers served during the third Macedonian War (p. 411). Apparently the bribe had to be repeated both for that and the intervening Syrian War. The fact was that to the lower, especially to the farming classes, war spelt ruin, to the upper, fame and fortune. Hence the immense and ever-widening breach between the economic status of the rich nobles and the poor plebs, a phenomenon which M. Colin calls 'la grande nouveauté dans l'histoire intérieure de Rome au début du 11^e siècle' (p. 321.) Doubtless in time the plebs themselves began to look on war as a profitable trade: the division of the rich spoil among the volunteer soldiers must have had a most deteriorating effect, and I refer the reader to some remarks on p. 262 of the book for the way in which the private soldier combined commerce with fighting. But at any rate in 200 B.C. the mass of the Roman people were most decidedly averse to a new war. M. Colin has noticed this, but has not shown how the opposition was disarmed.

Perhaps he might also have laid greater emphasis upon the lack of unity within the aristocracy itself. Not only when they were

¹ This fact was pointed out to me by Prof. Reid.

in power did the Catonic and other Antihellenist parties influence the policy of Rome: as an influential minority they must at any time have hampered the dealings of Flaminius and the Philhellenes. In talking of periods of Philhellenism and Antihellenism, it is necessary to remember that the same men with the same opinions existed throughout, and that only a certain proportion in each case would be carried along by the tide of popular opinion. On the whole, one would not be far wrong in saying that the policy which forced on the second Macedonian War was dictated by a handful of greedy, selfish, and determined men, bent on a successful military career, who, wringing from the Comitia a bare consent to their doings, proceeded to collect volunteers and engineered the whole affair according to their own ideas. These ideas of the military aristocracy could not be better illustrated than by M. Colin's own remarks on pp. 525 and 527. In speaking of Licinius Lucullus in Spain, he says: 'Son prédécesseur ne lui a rien laissé à faire; mais lui ne l'entend pas ainsi. Il est parti avec l'espoir de s'illustrer à son tour: ensuite, et surtout, *il est pauvre, il veut s'enrichir*, et il se persuade que sa province abonde en or et en argent: *il lui faut donc sa guerre*.' This horrible lust of warfare would not have been so often condoned had not the commercial classes seen on every new battle-field a new sphere for business. Hence the destruction of Carthage and Corinth, and the elevation of Delos to a free port. M. Colin has here not only developed the arguments of Mommsen, but has made a most excellent use of inscriptions, and, indeed, the thorough use of such evidence throughout this book is

one of its greatest merits. (See pp. 141, 263, 336, 635, 639, &c.)

There is no index, and the detailed table of contents by no means replaces it, as the author seems to suppose. An index and a conspectus of quotations should not have been omitted. The system of marginal headings is excellent.

Concerning some minor points: on p. 85 'Tyndarides, roi de Sparte,' should surely read, 'Tyndarides, rois de Sparte.'

On p. 623 M. Colin does not seem to have discounted largely enough for the anti-democratic prejudices of Polybius in his estimate of the Achaean leaders.

On p. 71 and *passim* M. Colin talks of the 'tribute' paid by Philip and Antiochus to Rome. This is surely an inaccuracy. Neither Philip in 196, nor Antiochus in 187, approached the position of tribute-paying vassals. What they paid was in the nature of a war indemnity, spread over a certain number of years. Besides this, they had to pay a smaller sum and supply a certain amount of corn to the troops in the field, before they were permitted to address the Roman Senate on the subject of peace—*i.e.* they had to buy the *indutiae* necessary for this purpose. This was a very usual Roman practice.

Finally, I notice that M. Colin has been unable to offer any more reasonable explanation of Cato's extraordinary change of attitude *re* Hellenism than the old and difficult one of his having decided to swim with the times.

These are small blemishes in a very interesting, original, and seasonable book.

LOUISE E. MATTHAEI

LIFE AND LETTERS IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.

Les derniers écrivains profanes: les Panégyristes—Ausone—le Querolus—Rutilius Namatianus. PICHON, RENÉ. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1906. 8vo. Pp. ix + 322. Fr. 7.50.

THIS volume is the first of a series projected by its author under the general title of

Études sur l'histoire de la littérature latine dans les Gaules. It is thus at once a contribution towards the general history of life and letters in the fourth century, and an essay towards a more detailed and specific treatment of a particular branch of that subject—the special development, that is, which life and letters took in the Gallic

provinces under the influence of what can already be distinguished as a national temper and genius. In the wider sphere, M. Pichon is already known as the author of a study of Lactantius, and of the philosophical and religious movement under the reign of Constantine. He now proposes to devote himself to work on the history of Latin literature in Gaul. The subject is one of great interest, and of the first importance in its bearing on the beginnings of French literature, and the development of French civilisation and nationality. Two volumes are announced to follow this one, the first on the early Christian writers, the second on the writers of the fifth century. The field is one which has already been fully explored. French scholars have been engaged on it continuously ever since Ampère, and have brought to it the patriotic ardour, the quick intelligence, and the fine critical sense characteristic of their nation. Little perhaps remains in the way either of discovery or of elucidation. But it is still possible to recombine facts, to set them in a newer or more striking light, and to apply to them the continually increasing experience accumulated in the progress of knowledge and the synthesis of history. This is the task to which M. Pichon has addressed himself.

There can be no doubt that when we reach the fourth century the history of Latin literature, if it is not to be a somewhat barren and uninteresting study, must follow that course of political and social development which was decentralising the whole fabric of the Empire and converting the provinces into nations, each with a separate individuality and a life and genius of its own. This tendency is indeed marked at a much earlier period. We see it clearly at work in the African school of the second century, even in the Spanish school of the first. But Rome was then still the centre of thought and life for the whole Empire. It is not until after the long anarchy of the third century—a period in which Latin literature was almost extinct—that the provincial literatures begin to take substantive form. The establishment of provincial capitals and the institution of putting the headship of the Empire into commission, steps in which Diocletian rather accepted obvious necessities

than initiated reasoned changes, started the fourth century on lines in which we already begin to trace the growth of the Western kingdoms and the germs of the mediaeval family of nations. In the Gallic provinces more particularly we begin now to feel the want of a common name for what is becoming a common nationality. In dealing with Eumenius of Autun or Ausonius of Bordeaux or Hilarius of Poitiers we instinctively and rightly feel that we are dealing with French authors.

The authors and works dealt with by M. Pichon in this volume require the French lightness of touch, and a large amount of that national pride or sympathy which makes any nation willing to make the most of its own beginnings, to render them attractive to a larger circle than that of professional scholars or specialising historians. Few people will ever read the *Panegyrici*; nor is there any reason why they should. Ausonius retains a precarious reputation on the strength of a single charming poem, and Rutilius has perhaps a more secure place in literature through a few imperishable lines in which, with a strange and unaccountable felicity, he paid to Rome, from the lips of a stranger and at a time when the Goth and Hun had already trodden her streets, a more complete and more splendid eulogy than all which had been lavished on her for ages by her own illustrious children. The *Querolus*, although the only extant Latin comedy besides those of Plautus and Terence, is to all intents and purposes unknown. It was first printed in 1564, and again in 1595. After that (except that it appears as an appendix to a seventeenth-century edition of Plautus) it lay wholly neglected until resuscitated about 1830. In this country a few people know of its existence from an article on it by Peacock the novelist (whose knowledge of the byways of the classics was extensive and peculiar) which appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* in 1852 and is reprinted in Peacock's collected works. In its native country, however, M. Louis Havet has lately made it the subject of acute and careful study, and has reinstated it as a document of importance in literary history, as well as a comedy of not inconsiderable literary merit.

St. Jerome, when he named *ubertas* and

nilor, without the Roman *gravitas*, as the specific quality of Gallic writers, laid his finger on what was then and is now characteristic of the national genius. It is so in their scholarship and criticism as well as in their creative literature. A book of this length and with this subject would certainly if written by any but a Frenchman have been unreadable. As it is, it is not only readable but full of interest. It would be unfair to look in it for profound originality or penetrating insight. 'Les Gaulois,' the author says justly, 'sont plus souples que forts, plus capables de s'assimiler les inventions d'autrui que d'en créer par eux-mêmes': and in dealing with them, something of their own spirit is required for sympathetic treatment. M. Pichon has a light touch, and that sympathy with his authors which is essential if they are to be made to yield all that they have of real value. Nothing could be better than the 35 pages of his introductory chapter, the subject of which is sufficiently indicated by its title, 'La littérature gallo-romaine et les origines de l'esprit français.' I cannot deny myself the pleasure of quoting two passages from it. In the first he is speaking of the 'Gallo-Roman' literature of the fourth century as a marked and individual type of Latin.

'Ainsi, dans l'éloquence d'apparat, quelle différence entre les *Florides* d'Apulée et les Panégyriques d'Eumène ou de Claudius Mamertinus! Là, des causeries fantaisistes et décousues, pleines de hors-d'œuvre capricieux, brillantes dans le détail, imagées, curieusement travaillées, avec une affectation perpétuelle d'esprit précieux et de style artiste: ici, des harangues solennelles et régulières, d'un ton soutenu, d'une allure noble, uniforme, tout à fait "académique." De même, dans la littérature théologique, Saint Hilaire est moins emporté que Tertulien, moins compliqué que Saint Augustin, moins tourmenté que Saint Jérôme; sa lucidité et sa précision dans la controverse, sa loyauté dans la polémique, son horreur des innovations capricieuses et des raffinements métaphysiques, son invincible besoin d'y voir clair, sa ferme et fière dignité dans ses relations avec ses collègues ou avec le pouvoir impérial, en font déjà, treize cents ans d'avance, un vrai prélat gallican.'

In the other, he is toying with, before reluctantly dismissing, the claim which French scholars have a natural and all but invincible tendency to make for some special share of national ownership in the great classical poets and prose authors of the Cisalpina.

'Assurément il serait tentant de rattacher à la littérature gallo-romaine des auteurs comme le Véronais Catulle, le Mantouan Virgile, le Padouan Tite-Live, le Cômains Pline le Jeune. Ainsi il suffirait de prendre Catulle, non pas lorsqu'il s'occupe à traduire ou à adapter des poèmes alexandrins, mais lorsque, cédant à sa fantaisie spontanée, il écrit des vers d'amour ou des vers satiriques. Les premiers ont, comme dit Fénelon, une "simplicité passionnée," une franchise précise et directe, une souplesse aisée, qui contraste avec la gaucherie pédantesque de Propertius et la virtuosité subtile d'Ovide: ce n'est pas en vain qu'on les a si souvent comparés à ceux de Musset, le plus français, le plus parisien de nos poètes lyriques. Quant à ses épigrammes, leur finesse (au moins relative) et leur naturel se distinguent de l'exagération bouffonne et triviale de celles de Martial comme la plaisanterie française s'oppose au grotesque ou au picaresque espagnol.'

That *au moins relative* came just in time; and to our more detached English outlook it is Propertius rather than Catullus who is the analogue or prototype of Musset. But the whole point of view in this and similar passages throughout the volume, the whole way of feeling and, in the expressive French term, 'savouring' his authors—for they are to him living people and actual fellow-countrymen—makes M. Pichon's book always interesting and sometimes really illuminating. It is a pleasure to look forward to its continuation, perhaps with the firmer handling that comes of experience, and some retrenchment of that diffuseness which is at present his undoubted defect, as it tends to be, with a few illustrious exceptions, that of French scholars who deal with the literature of scholarship: *ut ubertatem Gallicii nitoremque sermonis gravitas Romana condit.*

J. W. MACKAIL

WOMAN IN ANTIQUITY.

Woman; her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome and among the Early Christians. By JAMES DONALDSON, M.A., LL.D., Principal of the University of St. Andrews. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1907. 8vo. Pp. viii + 278. 5s. net.

PRINCIPAL DONALDSON has written a very good book on a topic where most writers are either pedantic or trifling. He has been content to take a moderate and reasonable view in each part of a wide subject, and in spite of this moderation the general effect of his work is somewhat revolutionary. The explanation is simple enough. Dr. Donaldson writes about the women of Greece and Rome as if they lived and breathed. '*When I can touch the body of books by night and by day, and when they can touch my body back again, when a university course convinces like a slumbering woman and child convince . . . I intend to reach them my hand.*' Walt Whitman might have reached his hand to some of the women who live in Dr. Donaldson's pages.

They live because Dr. Donaldson recognises the limitations of nearly all literature and tradition of the great past, books being written mainly about men and for men and—one may say—always by men. But look at circumstances, situations, from a womanly standpoint. Helen moves meekly, says Dr. Donaldson, and with propriety through experiences for which the *force majeure* of Eros and Paris are excuse enough, and spends the evening of her years universally respected at Sparta. 'She did nothing to excite Paris. She would have been happier with Menelaus' (p. 13). Religiously conservative Athens was almost the only place where women kept up this tradition of meekness. Dr. Donaldson, however, exaggerates the seclusion of women in Athenian houses. They were not imprisoned in a separate part of the house, for which indeed there was not accommodation: they merely withdrew from the space against the door

when a stranger came. In this respect of seclusion Athens was nevertheless exceptional. The freedom of Spartan women was nearer the average of Greek life and practice.

When we pass to Rome, Sparta furnishes the nearer parallel. And here Dr. Donaldson works out a theory which has some important and at the same time novel consequences. The Roman people start with an exceptionally high estimate of woman. Her position is improved by legislation and change of custom until the coming of Christianity, and then she is thrust into the background again. At first glance this looks like an exaggeration. But, curiously enough, the most impressive proofs of this theory may be found in writers upon whom Dr. Donaldson has not drawn. Ihering dwells on the fact that the Aryans gave a dowry to their daughters upon their marriage, so that they entered upon their new life possessed of a certain independent status, and in spite of the *coemptio*, he traces a similar primitive usage at Rome. On the other hand, the Greeks and Germans bought their wives, *i.e.* treated them as chattels (*Evolution of the Aryans*, 28). Hence the ground is already prepared for the statement of Sir Henry Maine that, 'led by their theory of Natural Law, the (Roman) juriconsults had evidently . . . assumed the equality of the sexes as a principle of their code of equity' (*Ancient Law*, 154). But Christianity tended 'from the very first to narrow this remarkable liberty' (*ib.* 156). At any rate, this coincidence of various writers shows that we have here a view of ancient society which cannot be hastily dismissed. Not only so, in the earliest form of the Christian society, women held office, as they had held it in the pagan systems. The four daughters of Philip preached (*Acts* xxi. 9). St. Paul himself contemplates the same practice, for he makes regulations for the women who preached (*I. Cor.* xi. 5). The woman-hating spirit that forbade the offices of religion to half the world, seems to have involved a breach both with the practice of antiquity and with the

first usages of the Church. It is dangerous in England to speak freely about these matters. Few, however, can read this interesting book without reconsidering some conventional opinions. Roman ideas of marriage had a good effect upon the happiness and morals of woman (120). Hence there is no ground to believe that the ancient world was utterly corrupt when Christianity arose (113). Moreover, the position of women was lower in the third century A.D. than two centuries earlier (148). I cannot agree, however, that this change was mainly due to the teaching

of St. Paul, for the famous passage in which woman is exhorted to learn from others with entire submissiveness (I. *Tim.* ii. 12) occurs in a document which in its present form is scarcely Pauline. Hence it is not permitted to refer the decline in woman's position to the immediate teaching and example of Jesus and Paul. The Christian mob of Alexandria offended against the classical tradition and apostolic teaching alike when they murdered Hypatia not only as a philosopher, but as a woman who taught.

FRANK GRANGER.

DRAMATIC CONTESTS IN ATHENS.

Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen mit einem Beitrage von GEORG KAIBEL herausgegeben von ADOLF WILHELM. (Sonderschriften des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien, Band VI.) Wien: Alfred Hölder, 1906. Pp. 279. 11½" x 9". 68 illustrations in the text.

STUDENTS of Greek literature have long been awaiting a new and definitive publication of the series of inscriptions dealing with the dramatic contests at Athens. These are, it is true, collected in Vol. II of the *Inscriptiones Graecae* and in Navarre's *Dionysos*, but in recent years much has been contributed by Capps, Reisch, and others to the arrangement and interpretation of the fragments, and it has been felt that no successful attempt could be made to write the history of the Greek drama without an accurate revision of the texts and a full commentary which should embody the results of the work done by various students and published in scattered books and periodicals. For this task Professor Wilhelm was fitted as, perhaps, no other living scholar. His extraordinary power of deciphering and restoring Greek inscriptions, together with his unrivalled knowledge of the treasures of the Epigraphic Museum at Athens, marked him out for such a work, and in undertaking and completing it he has rendered a great service not merely to epi-

graphists but to the far wider circle of those who are interested in the history of one of the most characteristic and important branches of Greek literature. From beginning to end the book impresses the reader as the work of a great master. The accuracy and minuteness with which the stones are examined and described, the brilliancy of many of the restorations suggested, the wealth and cogency of the arguments used either for constructive or destructive purposes, the command of the whole literature, ancient and modern, bearing on the subject, the sharp distinction drawn between the possible, the probable, and the certain—these are features which characterize all Wilhelm's work, and are specially emphasized here only because unhappily there still exist those who regard epigraphy as largely a matter of guess-work, as a superior species of 'missing word competition.' But the author has done more than merely re-edit and re-arrange the known texts, illustrating them by a commentary, the fulness of which leaves nothing to be desired: he has also published a number of fragments hitherto unknown, and has thus added very considerably to the extent and value of the series.

The book is not, indeed, faultless, but the few mistakes that occur are for the most part typographical errors of spelling or accentuation which will cause no confusion. On p. 125 (l. 7 from end) we must read 'kurz' for 'lang,' on p. 170 l. 6 'sechste' for

La
O
Av
EL
19

'fünfte,' on p. 271 *Χολαργεύς* for *Χολαρεύς*; the misplacement of the figure 10 on p. 107 has caused even the author to slip, (*ib.* l. 2). But the only serious error we have noted is in the Index (p. 276, col. ii., last 13 lines) where Kleomachos occurs twice and the alphabetical arrangement of the words from Kleomachos to Lysikrates is seriously at fault. Two further criticisms may perhaps be added, though they deal with questions of personal taste and not of scientific accuracy. The highly glazed paper employed, while rendering possible the admirable photographic reproductions contained in the book, adds considerably to its weight and to the difficulty of reading it by artificial light, while the custom of inserting references to modern literature in the body of the text and undistinguished either by italics or, in most cases, by brackets is apt to hamper the reader though it improves the look of the page.

After a brief summary of the chief contributions made to the study by previous writers, Wilhelm discusses in chapter i the eleven extant fragments of the list of victories won at the Dionysia both in tragedy and in comedy (*I. G.* ii 971). Three of these were hitherto unpublished, including one (*g*) of great interest, giving part of the lists for 341-0 and 340-39 and naming the poet Astydamos and the famous tragic actor Thettalus. The other two (*k, l*) are quite insignificant. Chapter ii contains a full account of the fourteen surviving fragments of the *διδασκαλίας*, including one (p. 43) discovered in 1901 and not previously published: these deal with tragedy and comedy, the Dionysia, and Lenaea, and range from 420 to about 160 B.C. The third and longest chapter treats of the thirty-nine fragments which we possess of the *Siegerlisten* (*I. G.*

ii 977),—lists of names of poets and actors, both tragic and comic, with figures denoting the number of victories each had won whether at the Dionysia or at the Lenaea. Seven of these fragments are published here for the first time, of which *e, h, r, s* are the most important and interesting. This list, first inscribed about 270 B.C., was continued down into the second century, and must originally have extended to some 50 or 60 columns: it is written on the inner side of an Ionic epistyle, but the form of the building to which it belonged cannot be restored with any certainty from the extant fragments. The same list is further discussed in chapter iv, which has a melancholy interest as being one of the last pieces of work on which Professor Georg Kaibel was engaged before his death. The rest of the book is of less importance. Chapters v and vi deal with a series of texts, some of them previously unpublished, bearing more or less directly upon the main subject: the most interesting of these are three fragments of a list set up at Rome recording the titles of comedies which won the first, second, third, or fourth prize, arranged under the names of the various comic poets (*I. G.* xiv 1097, 1098, 1098a). Finally, after a long and important chapter of Addenda giving the results of the latest discussions on the subject, there is an excellent—if, perhaps, somewhat too elaborate—Index, very materially increasing the value of the book.

Author and publisher are alike to be congratulated upon having produced a work which will be indispensable to everyone who undertakes a serious study of the history of Athenian drama, and will serve as a model of what epigraphical work may and should be.

M. N. TOD.

ROMAN EGYPT.

La Serie dei Prefetti di Egitto. I. Da Ottaviano Augusto a Diocleziano (A. 30 Av. Cr.—A.D. 288.) By LUIGI CANTARELLI. Roma: Accademia dei Lincei. 1906. Pp. 78. 5 lire.

PROF. CANTARELLI's book is published among the memoirs of the Accademia dei Lincei. The first part, which is now before us, covers the first three centuries of the Empire: the later part will continue the tale of the

Roman prefects of Egypt down to the Arab conquest of 642 A.D. The author's plan is clear and simple, and excellently carried out. A short introduction dealing mainly with previous attempts to construct a similar series is followed by a list of the prefects in chronological order. To each name is appended evidence of identification and where necessary short notes on obscure points of history or chronology raised by the authorities. The whole forms an admirable framework for the study of Roman Egypt.

For the 318 years with which this part deals we have the names of eighty-eight prefects, excluding some nine whose claims have been found wanting. This would give each prefect an average tenure of three and a half years. Where the sequence is most perfect we find seven prefects in eighteen years (under Pius and Marcus) and ten in seventeen years (under Marcus and Commodus). This average seems to have been maintained through the third century, in the first century the usual duration of a prefecture seems to have been longer. Putting these data together we may infer that fully a third of the names of prefects are missing from our lists. We are therefore not in a position yet to mark precisely the effect of the development of the Imperial system on the position of the prefect of Egypt. But it seems clear that the innovations of Hadrian affected in some measure the status of the prefecture. Tiberius kept C. Galerius at Alexandria for sixteen years: Avillius Flaccus for six. Vergilius Capito held office from 47-48 to 52 A.D.: Valerius Paulinus from 73 to 79, Sulpicius Similis from 107 to 112. One of Hadrian's prefects remained five and a half years: his last year of office and his retirement exactly coincide with the Emperor's visit to Egypt and his departure. From this time on the length of each prefecture becomes noticeably shorter, and the conclusion, that we may see in the

change the hand of Hadrian, seems probable and just. The new rule, if we may call it so, seems only to have been broken on special occasions when Egypt needed a strong hand. Thus Sempronius Liberalis (154-159) seems to have been specially commissioned to deal with brigandage and disturbances among the rural population and the nine years' prefecture of Subatianus Aquila (202-211) is no doubt connected with the severe policy which Septimius found it necessary to adopt in Egypt and which his son carried to extremes.

Egypt fortunately is a field where discoveries are still likely to be numerous and it is not past hope that a future edition of this valuable study may include a complete list of the prefects for three centuries at least. We might then arrive at a satisfactory answer to the most interesting question in Imperial history: how far was the continuity of the Civil Service preserved through the Palatine revolutions and military anarchy of the third century? It is unfortunate, though perhaps significant, that our information breaks down most completely just where it would be most valuable. Thus we have only one prefect ascribed (and that doubtfully) to the period of the Gordians, and for the darkest years in Roman History, the two decades from Philip to Gallienus we have only three names out of a possible ten.

It is much to be desired that scholars as competent as Prof. Cantarelli would take in hand the task of drawing up similar lists for all the provinces of the Empire. Even after Mommsen and Hirschfeld there are enormous lacunae to be filled. A series of volumes dealing with the personnel of the Roman civil and military services would be a great addition to our knowledge and would render possible the definitive history of the Imperial organization for which we are waiting.

G. M. YOUNG.

SHORT NOTICES

La Pianta di Roma dell' Anonimo Einsidlense: dissertazione letta alla Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia. Dal Prof. CHR. HUELSEN. Rome, 1906.

I ONLY purpose to note here very briefly, for the benefit of students of Roman topography, the appearance of this important monograph, which will doubtless be critically reviewed at some future time. Its importance lies both in the facsimile collocation reproduction of the precious leaves of the Codex that contain the Itinerary, and in the first-rate notes which Huelsen, who collated the leaves in 1901, modestly offers as a supplement to Lanciani's exhaustive and 'masterly' commentary. It is accompanied, moreover, by a valuable attempt at a reconstruction of the plan which we must suppose accompanied the Itinerary. Huelsen bases his reconstruction on two mediaeval plans of iconographic character and of elliptical shape—the thirteenth century plan attached to a codex of the Vatican, and the plan within the large map of the world in the Library at Hanover. Instead of the elliptical shape, however, Huelsen adopts the circular as accommodating better all the monuments mentioned in the Itinerary. For this circular shape, moreover, he can adduce both monumental and literary evidence in the effigy of Rome, seated within a circle of the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, and in the plan of Rome on a circular silver table which, according to Eginhard, belonged to Charles the Great.

E. S.

Geschichte der römischen Litteratur: von MARTIN SCHANZ. Erster Teil, erste Hälfte. Pp. vi + 362. (Third edition.) 1907. München: Oskar Beck. M. 7. Geb. M. 8. 80.

PROFESSOR SCHANZ's *History of Latin Literature* is so generally recognized as the standard authority that a notice of it now might well be thought superfluous. But this first instalment of the new edition, which is correctly described on the title page as a

'ganz umgearbeitete und stark vermehrte Auflage,' is practically a new work, dealing with the literature of Rome from its beginnings to the end of the Social War. The period is now allotted a separate volume and the number of pages assigned to it is 362 in place of 151. It is high time for the work to be translated into English. Teuffel's *History*, its former rival, has at last been translated twice.

Dionysi Halicarnasensis Antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt edidit CAROLUS JACOBY. Vol. IV. (Books x to end.) 1905.¹ Leipzig: Teubner. Pp. xii + 336. M. 4.

THIS instalment of the new Teubner text of Dionysius has not appeared before its time. The last was published in 1891, and the preceding two in 1885 and 1888 respectively, while the Didot recension of Kiessling's Teubner edition, of which the present editor does not think too highly (p. 27. l. 14 'receptit Prout neglegenter ut solet'), saw the light in 1886. We may hope that the 'multae causae' of delay as to which the preface says 'hoc loco afferre consilium non est' will permit of the publication of the promised indices within a more reasonable period. This Teubner text improves in more than one particular upon its predecessor. It is better printed, its critical apparatus (not always as clear as it might be) is fuller and is placed at the foot of the page, and recent suggestions for the improvement of the text have been collected with German, that is to say, with laudable diligence. Dr. Jacoby's own proposals are, however, with hardly an exception, either trivial or mistaken, and they certainly provide no justification for the *stultae* or *stultissime*s of which he is so liberal to the scholars from whose corrections he happens to dissent. To take two examples.

¹ This is the date on the title page, but the book does not appear to have been published till late in 1906.

At the beginning of xi. 58 he changes *τοιαῦτα τοῦ Κανολήγιου* . . . λέγοντος τ. Γαίου Κ. because in 57. 2 we have *παρελθὼν εἰς ἐξ αὐτῶν Γάιος Κανολήγιος*: which is much as if he should insist upon emending the mention of his name just above by the insertion of 'Karl' before 'Jacoby', because 'Carolus' stands in the preface to this notice. Again in x. 53. 3 sq. (p. 96) at a place where within four pages *stulte* is four times dealt out to Cobet Hertlein and Smit, we have the following account of the effects of a pestilence put into the mouth of Dionysius: οἱ μὲν ἀπ' ὀλιγορίας τοῦ καλοῦ, οἱ δὲ τὰ πᾶσι ἡδεῖα οὐκ ἔχοντες πολλοὺς μὲν ἐν τοῖς ὑπονόμοις τῶν στενωπῶν φέροντες ἐρρίπτουν τῶν ἀπογενομένων, πολλῶ δ' ἔτι πλείους εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ἐνέβαλλον, ἀφ' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα ἐκακοῦντο πρὸς τὰς ἀκτὰς καὶ τὰς ἡύνας. ἐκκυμαίνοντων γὰρ τῶν σωμάτων (of the bodies carried out by the currents) βαρεῖα καὶ δυσώδης προσπίπτουσα καὶ τοῖς ἔτι ἐρρωμένοις ἢ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀποφορὰ ταχεῖας ἔφερε τοῖς σώμασι τὰς τροπάς. Previous editors had endeavoured to bring the shores and banks into connexion with the currents: our editor says 'ego post ἡύνας interpunxi.' On the title page and elsewhere the editor still deifies his author in the genitive, but in pref. p. viii 'Dionysii librum undecimum' he slips into the usage of ordinary latinity.

J. P. P.

The Art of the Greeks. By H. B. WALTERS.

With 112 plates and 18 illustrations in the text. Methuen. 12s. 6d. net.

To write a good small book it is necessary to have written, or to be able to write, a good large one. Mr. Walters has done this for one department at least of Greek art, and those who read this book will not doubt that he could do something of the sort for others. It is written in just the right way to instruct and to interest the uninstructed: seizing upon salient points and main principles, it does not overwhelm the reader with details, but gives him a readable introduction to the several departments of its subject. These are: the Characteristics of Greek Art, the Beginnings, Architecture, Sculpture, Painting, Vases, Terra-Cottas, Gems, Coins, and Metal

Work. I may make a few suggestions in detail. The Hagia Triadha vases are of such importance that mention of them might have been expected in the Cretan section; and the question, how far Attic art may have been indebted to Mycenaean would have repaid discussion. It seems to be implied that the Bronze House at Sparta was made of bronze (p. 22). Colouring is used with effect on the Sidon sarcophagi now at Constantinople, and Mr. Walters perhaps inclines too strongly to the opposite view for Athens (p. 63). The identification of the palace at Cnossos with the Labyrinth (p. 32) seems to me a hypothesis without foundation, as I have tried to show elsewhere: it is a pity to repeat it in a popular book as if it were unquestioned, and I do not think it is regarded seriously by the Italian explorers of Crete, who know as much of the facts as any one.

The accounts of technical processes are good and useful, and they are necessary to be known by any one who would form a true judgment of works of art. Lastly, the plates are all that could be desired. Every one will miss some favourite in such a book, but they are given here in so generous abundance that it would be ungrateful to ask for more: none are given that we could wish away. The price is very modest for so handsome a book.

W. H. D. R.

C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Civili, erklärt von FR. KRANER u. FR. HOFMANN, elfte vollständig umgearbeitete Auflage von Dr. HEINRICH MEUSEL, Direktor des Kölnischen Gymnasiums in Berlin. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1906. 8vo. Pp. xvi + 374. Five Maps and Plates. M. 3.40.

STUDENTS of Caesar who are familiar with Kraner and Hofmann's edition of the *Bellum Civile* will welcome the careful revision of this work now published by Dr. H. Meusel the well known compiler of the great *Lexicon Caesarianum*. The tenth edition having been published as long ago as 1890 there was abundant scope for enlargement and improvement, and Dr. Meusel

assures us that the text of the eleventh edition differs in nearly 500 places from that of its predecessor. He has made fuller use too of the great work of Baron Stöffel, to whose fruitful labours he pays a well deserved tribute in his preface. It is well known that the text of the *B.C.* is in a very unsatisfactory state, allowing much license of conjecture. Meusel's unrivalled knowledge of the MSS. of Caesar and of the vast mass of textual criticism that has accumulated of recent years makes this work one of primary importance for scholars. Amid such abundance of material one can only pick out a few points here and there for criticism or comment.

In i. 5 § 3 M. adopts Hug's *senatorum audacia* for the corrupt *latorum audacia*. I do not think the expression is a natural one nor does it explain the origin of the corruption. Probably some words have been lost. 14 § 1 he inserts *non* before *aperto* (following Rubenius) apparently assuming that the existing text means that Lentulus opened the inner treasury and then suddenly fled *leaving it open*. This would indeed have been 'ein lächerliches Verhalten.' Why may we not suppose that Lentulus and his party took the ordinary precaution of closing the treasure chamber when they found it impossible to secure the contents? The text ought not to be wantonly altered because an editor lacks ordinary imagination. 19 § 2 I do not think M. has made out his case for the omission of *capere*. The phrase *consilium fugae capere constituit* is merely a little vague and roughly equivalent to 'determined to consider the question of flight.' 54 § 3 M. takes *carris iunctis devehit* to mean that each boat was carried on two wagons placed one behind the other. This may be right. One would like to know how and where this force crossed the Noguera Rivagorzana which lay in their way, and how they escaped the notice of Afranius' patrols. 61 § 1 M. expresses no view as to the method that Caesar adopted of diverting the stream. The question has been largely discussed by others. 85 § 6 M. follows other editors in condemning *tot tantasque classes paratas*. I beg to refer to my note on this passage. In Book ii on the difficult question as to the number of *aggeres* constructed by Trebonius in his siege of Massilia M. (in a special appendix) follows Stöffel as against Camille Jullian in assuming that there were two. I think he is right though Caesar's language is singularly inexact: it must however be remembered that the second book is largely based on the reports of Caesar's officers and not on personal observation. 18 § 5 the sense is improved by M.'s change of punctuation, the clause *qui . . . habuissent* being made to refer to *privatos*. 32 § 8 *vobis* is omitted after *clam* with a reference to Neue's Formenlehre, where it is stated that in the whole of Roman literature there is hardly any certain instance of *clam* as a preposition with the ablative.

In iii. 6 § 3 M. strangely allows the passive *arbitrantur* supporting it by four extremely doubtful passages in Cicero which he apparently accepts as genuine. The change to *quos . . . arbitrabatur* is very slight and the singular is actually found as a correction in one MS. 9 § 1 *discessu Liburnarum* is retained without remark. 31 § 4 M. takes *provincia* to be Syria not Asia, which he says is first mentioned in 32, but in the notes to 32 he inclines to think that Syria is the subject of that chapter also. The two chapters are concerned with Scipio and I have little doubt that in both *provincia* means Asia. 50 § 1 we find the doubtful assertion that *noctu* means 'by night' and *nocte* 'in the following night.' To suit this rule *noctu* in 54 § 1 is arbitrarily changed to *nocte*. 52 § 2 M. writes a lengthy note to correct the curious mistake made by previous editors who took *Germani* to be Pompey's men. The passage was correctly explained by Mr. Moberley and by myself independently some years ago but M. knows nothing of any English edition of Caesar. 53 § 3 there seems no reason for altering *una* to *viii* (= *octava*). Caesar merely emphasises the remarkable fact that four centurions out of one cohort were blinded. 82 § 4 the change of *praemiis* to *praeturiis* seems unnecessary, also the substitution of *qua* for each *qui* in 83 § 4. The use of *qui* does not in itself traverse the fact that each senator was supplied with three tablets: Caesar simply means that one set of senators would use the tablet of acquittal, another that of condemnation, etc. 91 § 3 M. after Fröhlich omits the impossible *eiusdem centuriae*. I have suggested that *centuriae* may have taken the place of an original *cohortis*.

On the difficult question of the site of the great battle M. wisely in my opinion follows the view of Baron Stöffel¹ who had carefully investigated the locality and was both a profound student of Caesar and also a military expert. M. admits the objections that have been raised but does not think them insuperable. That Caesar should with some inexactitude call the Enipeus a *rivus* in 88 and a *flumen* in 97 need not surprise us much when we notice that his *rivus* has *impeditae ripae* and is sufficiently wide or deep to protect his right flank. Clearly then in such a rugged country it might at one time be a raging torrent at another a thread of water, in other words it might at one time be a *rivus* at another a *flumen*, though it is a mark of careless writing to use both expressions in the same narrative.

In conclusion I may add that this edition is equipped with an elaborate critical appendix in which difficulties that could not be dealt with adequately in the notes are discussed at some length, with a geographical index, a careful chronological table, and some clearly drawn maps and plans.

A. G. PESKETT.

¹ While writing this notice I regret to read of the death at the age of 88 of this distinguished officer and scholar.

C. Iulii Caesaris de bello civili commentarii, edidit H. MEUSEL. Berolini apud Weidmannos. 1906. Svo. Pp. 116. M. 1.

THIS volume gives the text of Meusel's edition in a well bound compact and clearly printed form. In accordance with the general plan of the series to which it belongs it contains no preface or critical apparatus nor anything besides the text.

A. G. P.

Histoire Sommaire des études d'épigraphie grecque.

Par S. CHABERT. Pp. 168. 1906. Leroux.

THIS is a clearly written account of the history of Greek epigraphy and epigraphists, from the earliest times. It would be out of place to summarize its contents, because the book is itself a summary, and contains a great many facts and dates orderly arranged for the historian of scholarship. For the student of the inscriptions themselves there is nothing directly

bearing upon his work, but indirectly he may find help and profit from it.

Notes on Xenophon and others. By HERBERT RICHARDS, M.A. Pp. xii + 358. Grant Richards. 1907. 6s. net.

MR. RICHARDS has here republished a number of articles which have appeared in this *Review*; a few pages of notes on the *Cyropaedia* are printed for the first time. The notes have been long before the world of scholars, and in any case it would not be proper to review them in the journal where they appeared; but we offer a hearty welcome to the volume, expressing a hope that it may lead some one to read Xenophon outside the *Anabasis*. The 'others' are Herodotus, Plutarch, Pausanias, Erotici Graeci, Catullus, Propertius, Horace, Juvenal, and there are two papers on Attic Syntax.

OBITUARY

PROFESSOR TRAUBE, DIED JUNE, 1907.

LUDWIG TRAUBE, Professor of Mediaeval Literature at the University of Munich, was the son of a medical professor at Berlin. To readers of the *Classical Review* he is best known as the co-editor, with Dümmler, of the 'Carmina Latina Medii Aevi,' to historians as the reviser of the last edition of Wattenbach's 'Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter' and as a frequent contributor to the 'Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde.' But it is as a palaeographer that Traube will be missed the most. Indeed his death inflicts a quite irreparable loss on the twin studies of Latin Palaeography and Latin Textual Criticism. Had he been spared until he had completed his 'Palaeographische Forschungen,' we should have had a full and final account of Latin Manuscripts, their peculiarities of script, the scriptorium from which each has come, the mediaeval scholars whose influence they shew. But now, all this work will have to be done by others. And who is competent to take Traube's place? He had an unrivalled knowledge of the literary life of the Middle Ages, so that a mediaeval MS. of a

Latin classic appeared after his handling of it in quite a new light. The Berne MS. of Horace and Servius was shewn to be a copy of an original which emanated from the circle of Sedulius, that Irish scholar who, with a band of compatriots, visited the monastery libraries of Europe in the ninth century, imparting and receiving the best instruction of the time. The Berne Valerius Maximus was traced to Lupus, the learned Abbot of Ferrières, who had recorded in the margins the variants from a MS. of Julius Paris's Epitome. The Vatican Livy was revealed as a transcript made by certain monks of Tours from the Paris Puteanus. How different all this was from the lifeless accounts of these MSS. given in the prolegomena of previous editions! If any editor of Latin authors wishes to be ushered into this new world of study, the mediaeval transmission of Latin texts, let him read three papers of Traube published in the Proceedings of the Bavarian Academy, (1) 'O Roma Nobilis,' (2) 'Untersuchungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte römischer Schriftsteller,' (3) 'Perona Scottorum.'

Traube's edition of the Rule of St. Bene-

dict
unh
edit
hist
pen
ling
mos
two
lucic
auth
shew
what
to m
the p
deca
good
my l
com
struc
the a
by l
expe
biliti
comp
the p
cially
great
contr
xxvi)
orum
Thes
extra
Trau
wealth
libran
study
alway
Unive
of Co
they v
of the
take
minus

TH
Brown
passed
was b

dict has supplied a model of perfection, unhappily a quite unattainable model, for editors of the classics. Each stage in the history of the text, from the time it was first penned by St. Benedict down to the Carolingian transcriptions, is traced out with the most convincing fulness of detail, and the two different versions have their origin lucidly explained. Perhaps Livy is the Latin author for whom Traube did most. He has shewn us how many ancient MSS., and of what parts of the History, were transmitted to modern times, and he has clearly defined the problem for future editors of the different decades of the book. Catullus occupied a good deal of his attention, but he never, to my knowledge, carried out, or, at least, never committed to paper his intended reconstruction of the Verona archetype, and of the ancient edition whose text it embodies, by help of all the clues available to an expert in Latin Palaeography. The possibilities of this line of research, once that a complete knowledge should be attained of the peculiarities of Latin script, and especially of Abbreviations, he regarded as very great. And in his investigation of the various contractions of *autem* (in 'Neues Archiv,' vol. xxvi) and of *noster, vester* (in 'Perrona Scottorum'), he shewed the method of attaining this. These two investigations were based on an extraordinarily large collection of material, for Traube was, unlike most foreign scholars, wealthy enough to visit all the important libraries of Europe and make a prolonged study of their manuscript treasures. It has always seemed to me that some English University graduates might turn their love of Continental travel to good account, if they would spend some time in the Libraries of the towns through which they pass, and take a note of such details in the older minuscule MSS. (of the eighth and ninth

centuries). A very welcome addition to Traube's account of *autem* and *noster (vester)* would be statistics of the various contractions used for *qui* (in its various cases) and its derivatives (*quia, quum, quam, quoniam*, etc). These contractions are not capricious. When a large enough mass of details of their use has been accumulated, it will be easy to extract the clues which they furnish for the history of Latin texts.

Traube more than once expressed to me his admiration for Henry Bradshaw's gift of what he called 'sympathy with MSS.' Certainly Traube himself had this gift in a marked degree. Both of them had that loving admiration of the 'written page' to which Austin Dobson's lines give expression :

'Not as ours the books of yore,
Rows of type and nothing more.'

And Traube had, like Bradshaw, the power of communicating his enthusiasm to others. One of his pupils has worked out in detail his theory of the connexion of the Berne Valerius Maximus with Bishop Lupus (J. Snetz: 'ein Kritiker des Val. Maximus im 9 Jahrhundert,' Neuburg, 1901). Another is engaged on a favourite subject of the master's, those 'subscriptiones' in MSS. which preserve a record of the ancient editions of the Latin Classics. A third will see through the press the only available part of the projected 'opus magnum' on Latin Palaeography, the part dealing with Half-Uncial script. Traube's last piece of work, an account of the contractions of 'nomina sacra' (e.g. *ds* for 'deus') will appear as vol. ii. of his 'Quellen und Untersuchungen' in the latter part of this year.

W. M. LINDSAY.

ALBERT HARKNESS, PH.D., LL.D.

THE death of Prof. Albert Harkness of Brown University (U.S.), should not be passed unnoticed by British scholars. He was born on Oct. 6, 1822, and educated at

Brown University. After ten years of teaching in a school, he studied in Germany, and received the degree of Ph.D. in 1854, at the University of Bonn. On his return to

didides (1889), and a third is a translation of the *Epistle to the Romans*. Both these are executed in the old grand manner, but they are, in truth, but fragments. The two volumes of *Scholia* to Aristophanes, from the Ravenna MS., appeared in 1896, but they were printed in an unpleasing type, and a learned German soon proved, as Rutherford himself admitted, that the *scholia* of Ravennas were not nearly so good as those of Venetus. Immediately on his retirement from school work (1901), Rutherford took these *scholia* in hand, and in 1905 produced a third volume of commentary and criticism on them. He did not expect it to be much read, and it is not: for the text was forgotten before the notes appeared. Those who knew the author

can read some sense of disappointment between the lines.

Numerous and important as Rutherford's books are, none of them, nor all of them together are so impressive as the man himself was. He was like Burke, of whom Dr. Johnson said you could not stand under an entry with him for five minutes without thinking 'This is a very extraordinary man.' There was something heroic about him always, and of late years something tragic. He was attacked long ago by an obscure disease of the heart which wasted his magnificent frame but did not abate his masterful character or his shrewd and unwearyed intellect. A collection of his sayings would be as good as *Scaligerana*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of Books is given in inches: 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly). They are unbound unless the binding is specified.

* *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Aeschylus. Die Eumeniden des Aischylos: erklärende Ausgabe von Friedrich Blass. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 180. Berlin, Weidmann. 1907. M. 5.

Bericht over den Wedstrijd in Latijnsche Poëzie van het Jaar 1906. 9" x 6". Pp. 8 (19-26). Amsterdam, Johannes Müller. 1907.

Buchanan (E. S.) The Four Gospels from the Codex Corbeiensis, being the first complete edition of the MS. now numbered Lat. 17225 in the National Library at Paris, together with fragments of the Catholic Epistles, of the Acts and of the Apocalypse from the Fleury Palimpsest (h) now numbered Lat. 6400 G in the same Library, and for the first time completely edited with the aid of the printed text of Berger, 'Le Palimpseste de Fleury,' by E. S. B., M.A., B.Sc. (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. V.*) 9" x 8". Pp. viii + 124, with 3 facsimiles. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1907. 12s. 6d. net.

Classical Association of Scotland. Proceedings 1906-7. 8" x 6". Pp. vi + 96. Edinburgh, H. & J. Pillans & Wilson. 1907. Cloth.

Deissmann (Adolf) New Light on the New Testament from records of the Graeco-Roman period by A. D., translated from the Author's MS. by Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. xii + 128. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark. 1907. Cloth, 3s. net.

Demosthenes. Orationes recognovit brevique adnot. critica instruxit S. H. Butcher. II. i. (*Script. Class. Bibl. Oxon.*) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii + 451-808. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1907. Paper, 3s. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Horace. The Odes of Horace, a translation and an exposition by E. R. Garnsey, B.A. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii + 230. London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1907. Cloth, 6s.

Kelsey (Francis W.) The Position of Latin and Greek in American Education. I. The present position of Latin and Greek. II. The value of Latin and Greek as educational instruments. III. Latin and Greek in our courses of study. (Reprinted from the *Education Review*, New York, Dec. 1906; Jan. 1907; Feb. 1907.) 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6". Separate. Pp. 461-472, Pp. 59-76, Pp. 162-176.

Lunn (A. C. P.) Latin Exercises on Latin models. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 96. London, Edward Arnold. 1907. Cloth, 1s.

Marshall (Douglas H.) The Beginner's Book of Greek. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 64. London, Edward Arnold. 1907. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

Michigan Classical Conference. Programme of the Twelfth. (Reprinted from the *School Review*. Vol. XIV, No. 8. Oct. 1906. Pp. 560-562.)

- Mommisen* (Theodor) Gesammelte Schriften. Band III. Juristische Schriften. Band III. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii + 632. Berlin, Weidmann. 1907. M. 15.
- Payne-Gallwey* (Sir Ralph) Bart. A summary of the history, construction, and effects in warfare of the Projectile-throwing Engines of the Ancients, with a treatise on the structure, power, and management of Turkish and other Oriental bows of mediaeval and later times. 12 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 70, with 40 illustrations. London, Longmans, Green & Co. 1907. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Peaks* (Mary B.) The General Civil and Military Administration of Noricum and Rhaetia. Reprint from Vol. IV. of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology. 10" x 7". Chicago University Press. 1907. Pp. 161-230.
- Rankin* (E. M.) The Role of the *Máγιστοι* in the life of the Ancient Greeks. Chicago University Press. 1907. Pp. vi + 92. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6".
- Pradel* (Fritz) Griechische und süditalienische Gebete, Beschwörungen und Rezepte des Mittelalters. (*Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, von A. Dieterich und R. Wünsch. Band III. Heft 3.) 9" x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. viii + 253-404. Giessen, Topelmann. 1907.
- Rufus Crispinus*. Carmen praemio aureo ornatum in certamine poetico Hoeffitiano accedunt sex carmina laudata. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 128 (?). Amsterdam, Johannes Müller. 1907.
- Schmidt* (Henry) Veteres philosophi quomodo judicaverint de precibus. (*Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, von A. Dieterich und R. Wünsch. Band IV. Heft 1.) 9" x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 74. Giessen, Topelmann. 1907.
- Schubart* (W.) und Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (U. von) Griechische-Dichterfragmente. Hälfte 2. Lyrische und dramatische Fragmente. (*Berliner Klassikertexte*. Heft 5, Hälfte 2.) 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. ii + 160, mit 6 Lichtdrucktafeln. Berlin, 1907. M. 11.
- Seneca*. Étude sur les Métaphores et les comparaisons dans les œuvres en prose de Sénèque le Philosophe par D. Steyns. (*Université de Gand. Recueil de Travaux publiés par la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres*. Fasc. 33.) 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 166. Gand, J. Vuylsteke. 1906. Fr. 4 (?).
- Tacitus*. Cornelli Taciti annalium ab excessu divi Augusti libri. The Annals of Tacitus, edited with introduction and notes by Henry Furneaux. Vol. II. Books xi-xvi. Second Edition, revised by H. F. Pelham and C. D. Fisher. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. clii + 520, with a map of Armenia. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1907. Cloth, 21s. (\$5.25).
- The Value of Humanistic, particularly Classical, Studies as a preparation for the study of Law, from the point of view of the Profession*. A Symposium from the Proceedings of the Classical Conference held at Ann Arbor, Michigan, March 27th, 1907. 10" x 7". Pp. 409-435. Reprinted from the *School Review*, June 1907.
- *For the study of Medicine and of Engineering, from the point of view of the Professions*. A Symposium, etc., March 29th, 1906. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 389-414. Reprinted from the *School Review*, June 1906.
- Vergil*. Vergils Gedichte erklärt von Th. Ladewig und C. Schaper. Erstes Bändchen. Bukolika und Georgika. Achte Auflage bearb. von Paul Deuticke. (*Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Schriftsteller mit deutschen Anmerkungen* begr. von M. Haupt und H. Sauppe.) 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. viii + 292. Berlin, Weidmann. 1907. M. 3.